



Published in final edited form as:

Gastrointest Endosc. 2024 September ; 100(3): 352–381. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2024.04.2905.

Quality Indicators for Colonoscopy

Douglas K. Rex, MD, MASGE¹, Joseph C. Anderson, MD^{2,3,4}, Lynn F. Butterly, MD^{5,6,7}, Lukejohn W. Day, MD^{8,9}, Jason A. Dominitz, MD, MHS, MASGE^{10,11}, Tonya Kaltenbach, MD, MS, MASGE^{12,13}, Uri Ladabaum, MD¹⁴, Theodore R. Levin, MD¹⁵, Aasma Shaikat, MD, MPH, FASGE^{16,17}, Jean-Paul Achkar, MD¹⁸, Francis A. Farraye, MD, MSc, FASGE¹⁹, Sunanda V. Kane, MD, MSPH, FASGE²⁰, Nicholas J. Shaheen, MD, MPH, MASGE²¹

¹Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Medicine, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN

²Department of Medicine/Division of Gastroenterology, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Hanover, NH

³Department of Medicine/Division of Gastroenterology, White River Junction VAMC, White River Junction VT

⁴University of Connecticut School of Medicine, Farmington CT

⁵Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Hanover, NH

⁶Department of Medicine, Section of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH

⁷New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry, Lebanon, NH

⁸Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

⁹Chief Medical Officer, University of California San Francisco Health System, San Francisco, CA

¹⁰VA Puget Sound Health Care System, Seattle, WA

Conflicts of Interest:

Douglas K. Rex - Consultant: Olympus Corporation, Boston Scientific, Braintree Laboratories, Norgine, GI Supply, Medtronic, Acacia Pharmaceuticals; Research Support: Olympus Corporation, Medivators, Erbe USA Inc., Braintree Laboratories; Shareholder: Satisfai Health

Tonya Kaltenbach – Consultant: Verily Life Sciences, Olympus

Uri Ladabaum – Advisor: Universal Dx, Kohler Ventures, Vivante Health, Lean Health; Consultant: Freenome, Guardant, Neptune, Media EarlySign, Medtronic

Theodore R. Levin – Research Support: Freenome, Inc.

Aasma Shaikat – Consultant: Iterative Health

Francis A. Farraye – Consultant: AbbVie, Avalo Therapeutics, BMS, Braintree Labs, Fresenius Kabi, GI Reviewers, GSK, IBD Educational Group, Iterative Health, Janssen, Pharmacosmos, Pfizer, Sandoz Immunology, Viatrix; Data and Safety Monitoring Board: Lilly

Sunanda Kane – Consultant: Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, InveniAI, Janssen, Fresenius Kabi, PredicatMed, Lilly, Takeda; Section Editor: UptoDate

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

- ¹¹Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, WA
- ¹²Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA
- ¹³Division of Gastroenterology, San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Francisco, CA
- ¹⁴Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA
- ¹⁵Kaiser Permanente Division of Research, Oakland, CA
- ¹⁶Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY
- ¹⁷New York Harbor Veterans Affairs Health Care System, New York, NY
- ¹⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, Digestive Diseases and Surgery Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH
- ¹⁹Mayo Clinic, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, 4500 San Pablo Road, Jacksonville, FL
- ²⁰Mayo Clinic Rochester, Rochester, MN
- ²¹Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

Introduction

Colonoscopy is the cornerstone of colorectal cancer (CRC) prevention worldwide and in the United States^{1–4}. In the U.S., colonoscopy is commonly used for primary CRC screening and is the first and preferred colorectal imaging test in patients presenting with symptoms, positive screening tests other than colonoscopy^{1–4}, undergoing surveillance after resection of CRC or pre-cancerous polyps^{5,6}, strong family history of CRC or advanced precancerous lesions¹ as well as dysplasia surveillance in ulcerative colitis and Crohn's colitis⁷.

Evidence indicates colonoscopy reduces the incidence of CRC and prevents CRC mortality^{8–23} (Table 1). Reduction in incidence and mortality of CRC with colonoscopy is greater in the left colon than the right colon²⁴. In the first randomized controlled trial comparing colonoscopy to no screening, patients who adhered and underwent colonoscopy (per-protocol analysis) had a 31% reduction in CRC incidence and a 50% reduction in CRC mortality²⁵. Several factors, including earlier than planned reporting of trial results, absence of stage shift in CRCs detected in the colonoscopy arm (suggesting symptomatic patients were enrolled in the colonoscopy arm), and lower than expected cecal intubation and adenoma detection, indicate the study may have underestimated the benefits of colonoscopy²⁵.

The impact of colonoscopy on CRC and other outcomes (e.g. polyp detection, assignment of screening and surveillance intervals) is highly operator-dependent. Detection of pre-cancerous colorectal lesions is highly variable^{26–28}, and is associated with the risk of developing post colonoscopy CRC^{21, 22}. In response to evidence of inconsistent

performance, professional gastroenterology and endoscopy societies began an organized movement two decades ago to improve the quality of technical performance and reduce the operator-dependence of colonoscopy²⁹. This document represents the latest update of recommendations from the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ASGE)/ American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) quality task force. Previous recommendations from this task force were published in 2006³⁰ and 2015³¹. This update reflects new evidence appearing since 2015.

High quality colonoscopy includes adequate bowel preparation, safe colonoscope insertion to the proximal extent of the colon, detailed examination with identification of all pre-cancerous lesions, and complete and curative resection of these lesions. The process is completed by thorough and accurate documentation of findings, and assignment of any appropriate screening or surveillance follow-up at cost-effective intervals based on recommendations from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on CRC³². High quality performance in one aspect of colonoscopy does not ensure adequate performance in others. For example, colonoscopists may be effective at detection but not resection of pre-cancerous lesions or vice versa³³. Understanding deficiencies in performance is generally gained only through quality measurement. Given the impact of inadequate performance on critical outcomes including cancer development, failure to measure performance is unacceptable.

This document presents many quality indicators related to the technical performance of colonoscopy. Practicing colonoscopists are encouraged to make quality measurements related to all the indicators, but this may not be feasible from a time, staffing or cost perspective. Therefore, the document recommends priority quality indicators (Table 2). These indicators were chosen based on clinical relevance, evidence of variable performance, and feasibility of measurement. Measurement of priority indicators is considered essential.

Methodology

The first version of this document was published by the ASGE/ACG Task Force on Quality in Endoscopy in 2006^{30,32} and it was revised in 2015^{30,31}. This current revision integrates new data relevant to existing quality indicators and introduces new indicators based on interval progress in the field. This document focuses on quality indicators unique to colonoscopy (Table 3). The indicators that are common to all GI endoscopic procedures are presented in detail in a separate paper³⁴ and are, for completeness, also listed in Table 4. Indicators common to all GI endoscopic procedures are not addressed in this document, except in some instances where discussion specific to colonoscopy is required.

As in the preceding versions, we prioritized indicators that have wide-ranging clinical implications, are associated with variation in practice and outcomes, and have been validated in clinical studies. When supportive data were absent, indicators of clinical importance were chosen by expert consensus. We have made substantial progress in measuring performance; however, feasibility and efficiency challenges remain. The task force included a limited number of highly relevant, but not yet easily measurable indicators.

As before^{30,31}, quality indicators are divided into 3 time periods: pre-procedure, intra-procedure, and post-procedure. Each quality indicator is classified as an outcome or

process measure. Outcome measures are impactful in improving quality of care but can be difficult to measure in clinical practice. Outcome measures often require large amounts of data and/or long-term follow-up, and their measurement may be confounded by other factors. In such cases, process indicators are provided as surrogate measures of high-quality endoscopic practice. The relative value of a process indicator hinges on the evidence supporting its association with a clinically relevant outcome, and such process measures are emphasized. The measures in this document pertain to endoscopic care. The quality of care is influenced by additional factors, including those related to endoscopy centers. These structural measures are covered in a separate document dedicated to unit-level quality³⁵.

For this update, the task force critically appraised existing quality indicators based on several factors including ongoing relevance and strength of evidence. Additionally, new quality indicators were proposed and, if appropriate, adopted by consensus based on similar considerations. For each indicator, relevant articles were identified by the authors through a systematic search of PubMed (U.S. National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health) from January 2014 – the date of the last update of this document – through December 2022. The search strategies for each indicator included a combination of subject headings (MeSH in PubMed) and pertinent keywords. English language restrictions were applied. To identify additional articles, the authors reviewed PubMed’s “similar articles” and manually searched reference lists of relevant papers. Searches were facilitated by health science librarians with expertise in systematic review. Based on this revised literature review, the strength of recommendation for each indicator was evaluated according to a previously employed framework (Table 5). Within this framework, the strength of each quality indicator is divided across a spectrum from “1A”, denoting a strong quality indicator that can be applied to most clinical settings, to “3”, denoting a weak quality indicator due to lack of evidence requiring expert opinion. The strength of recommendation grade for each indicator was established with consensus of the authors.

The process and outcome measures included in this document are attached to a performance target and, therefore, each measure is considered a quality indicator. The task force selected performance targets based on published benchmarking data, informed by literature review. In the absence of available data, when expert consensus considered failure to perform a given quality indicator a “never event,” such as failure to monitor vital signs during sedation, the performance target was expressed as > 98%, since only in exceptional circumstances would the quality indicator not be fulfilled.

Quality indicators are intended to serve as a framework for quality improvement efforts. The included quality indicators and associated performance targets do not necessarily reflect the standard of care, credentialing requirements, or training standards, and it is a misuse to employ any of the quality indicators in this document as such.

Priority Indicators

The 2006 and 2015 ASGE/ACG quality documents proposed many indicators for quality measurement in the technical performance of colonoscopy^{30, 31}. Quality measurement is relatively new and requires resources. The 2015 document proposed priority indicators that every endoscopy unit should endeavor to measure.

The current revision also proposes priority indicators (Table 2). Priority indicators reflect the strength with which they are linked to important colonoscopy outcomes, such as prevention of cancer and cancer death, the feasibility of measurement in clinical practice, evidence for variability in performance, and consensus regarding the significance of the indicator as a continuing or emerging element of high-quality technical performance of colonoscopy. The rationale for selection of priority indicators in this document (Table 2) is largely presented in the discussion of individual indicators below. We recommend that quality improvement efforts initially focus on High Priority Indicators and then progress to other indicators once it is ascertained that endoscopists are performing above recommended thresholds, either at baseline or after corrective interventions.

The cecal intubation rate (CIR) remains a quality indicator for colonoscopy in this update. However, while CIR was a priority indicator in 2015³⁰, its status as a priority indicator has been changed in this update (Table 2). High CIRs are associated with prevention of CRC³⁶, and failed intubation leads to costs and inconvenience associated with supplementary imaging and repeat attempts at colonoscopy. Thus, we continue to recommend measurement of cecal intubation rates. However, substantial evidence indicates that most gastroenterologists achieve CIRs above recommended thresholds and maintain them^{37, 38}. Therefore, sustained measurement of CIR may not be an effective use of resources in units where there is no evidence of inadequate performance.

New priority indicators are noted by an asterisk in Table 2. One of these is adequacy of bowel preparation adequacy which is fundamental to cost-effective colonoscopy. The second is the sessile serrated lesion detection rate (SSLDR), which is selected based on evidence it will contribute to cancer prevention (see below).

General colonoscopy indicators

Pre-procedure indicators

Appropriate indications for colonoscopy

1. Frequency with which colonoscopy is performed for an appropriate indication and the indication is documented.

Strength of recommendation: 1C+

Performance target: $\geq 95\%$

Measure type: Process

Appropriate indications for colonoscopy are listed in Table 6. Each procedure report should include an accepted indication or an explanation if the indication is considered non-standard. Dates and findings from prior colonoscopies (e.g. cancer, advanced lesions, or non-advanced lesions) that drive the current colonoscopy should be documented with the indication.

When colonoscopy is used for appropriate indications there is a higher yield of clinically relevant diagnoses^{39 40 41 42}. Accepted indications lists can be used to screen colonoscopy referrals for appropriateness^{43 44 45 46}.

Rate of bowel preparation adequacy (priority indicator)

2. Percentage of patients undergoing colonoscopy with adequate bowel preparation, preferably defined as Boston Bowel Preparation Scale score ≥ 2 in each of 3 colon segments, or by description of the preparation as excellent, good, or adequate. The recommended screening or surveillance interval should be consistent with US Multi-Society Task Force recommendations.

Strength of recommendation: 1C

Performance target: $\geq 90\%$

Measure type: process

The ASGE/ACG Task Force on Quality indicators for colonoscopy relies heavily on the bowel preparation recommendations of the US Multi-Society Task Force (MSTF)⁴⁷. When bowel preparation is adequate, the subsequent recommended interval for repeat screening or surveillance colonoscopy should be consistent with the MSTF recommendations^{47,6} unless there is a documented indication for earlier colonoscopy [e.g. an inherited genetic disorder, strong family history, or a disease process such as chronic inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)].

As per the MSTF recommendations, patients with an inadequate preparation should have a repeat study within one year⁴⁷. The MSTF recommended in 2015 that at least 85% of outpatient colonoscopies should be accompanied by an adequate preparation⁴⁷. The European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) recommended a 90% target⁴⁸. The MSTF recommendations are currently under revision and based on continued evidence of high rates of adequate preparation in clinical trials⁴⁹, the ASGE/ACG Task Force recommends the 90% threshold.

Inadequate preparations substantially increase the cost of colonoscopy delivery⁵⁰, and create risk and inconvenience for patients, thus warranting ranking as a priority indicator.

Like the MSTF, we recommend that the colonoscopy report in the case of adequate preparation should include descriptors of bowel preparation as “adequate”, “excellent” or “good”, or record a Boston Bowel Preparation Scale (BBPS) score of ≥ 2 in all three colon segments^{51, 52}. Because it utilizes scores and explicit descriptions of what the scores mean, the BBPS is preferred. Further, the BBPS is specifically designed for use after completion of intraprocedural cleaning, which is the most clinically relevant time point to assess cleansing quality. To count toward meeting the 90% adherence target, the recommended follow-up interval must be consistent with MSTF post-polypectomy³² or post-cancer resection⁵³ surveillance recommendations.

Intra-colonoscopy indicators

Cecal intubation rate (priority indicator)

3. Percentage of patients undergoing colonoscopy with intact colons who have full intubation of the cecum with photo documentation of cecal landmarks

Strength of recommendation: 1C

Performance target: $\geq 95\%$

Measure type: process

A trained colonoscopist should achieve a high cecal intubation rate (CIR) with a very high level of safety. Cecal intubation is defined as passage of the colonoscope tip proximal to the ileocecal valve, and fully into the cecal caput so that the appendiceal orifice can be identified and photographed, and the medial wall of the cecum between the appendiceal orifice and ileocecal valve can be thoroughly examined³¹. Low CIR has been associated with higher post colonoscopy CRC (PCCRC) rates³⁶.

High CIR should be achievable with extremely low rates of insertion related perforation. Mechanical rupture of the colon can be prevented by reduction of loops and bends in the insertion tube, and avoiding pushing against fixed resistance. Use of thinner, more flexible instruments can reduce rupture risk when the colon is diseased from conditions such as severe diverticular disease, radiation injury, chronic dialysis, long-term corticosteroid use, or fixation due to pelvic surgery. Barotrauma perforations occur only in patients with severe sigmoid angulation and narrowing, primarily associated with severe diverticular disease. The risk of barotrauma should be anticipated in all patients with a complex sigmoid colon and the colonoscopist should consider stopping gas insufflation, and using water immersion until the sigmoid is traversed and the proximal colon decompressed⁵⁴.

CIRs above 95% for all indications are readily achievable by high percentages of independently practicing colonoscopists^{37, 55–58}. All independently practicing colonoscopists should have CIR measured until it is consistently above the recommended target. After this, continued CIR measurement is optional and can be performed intermittently or not at all in the case of a consistent track record of performance above recommended thresholds. Limited evidence of variable performance for many practicing gastroenterologists, evidence that high performance is sustained, and the obvious ceiling level of 100% justify reduction in measurement for high level performers.

Adenoma detection rate (priority indicator)

4. Percentage of patients ≥ 45 years old undergoing colonoscopy for screening, surveillance, or diagnostic indications other than positive non-colonoscopy screening tests (e.g., fecal tests or CT colonography) who have one or more conventional adenomas detected and verified by pathology. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, genetic cancer syndromes (e.g., polyposis), IBD, undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms, are excluded from the calculation.

Strength of recommendation: 1C+

Performance target: $\geq 35\%$

Measure type: outcome

The adenoma detection rate (ADR) is the most clinically relevant and best validated quality indicator in colonoscopy. ADR was proposed in 2002²⁹ in response to evidence that adenoma detection and cancer prevention were variable in clinical practice. ADR

was proposed in 2002 as the percentage of patients aged 50 years and older undergoing colonoscopy for indications other than IBD or polyposis syndromes who had ≥ 1 conventional adenoma resected and verified by pathology. The initial proposed threshold was 20% (25% in men and 15% in women) and was arbitrarily set at a level below the mean prevalence of adenomas detected at initial screening colonoscopy studies performed in average risk individuals^{59–62}. In 2006 the recommendation for ADR was changed to the fraction of patients age 50 years and older having ≥ 1 conventional adenoma in first time screening colonoscopy³⁰. This change acknowledged that the original target levels were derived from screening colonoscopy studies^{59–62}. In 2010, a large screening colonoscopy study showed that hazard ratios for post colonoscopy CRC (PCCRC) were increased tenfold when colonoscopy was performed by colonoscopists with ADRs $< 20\%$ compared to colonoscopy performed by colonoscopists with ADRs $> 20\%$ ²¹. In 2015, the minimum acceptable thresholds were increased to 25% (30% in men and 20% in women)³¹ after a large study showed further gains in protection against PCCRC with ADRs above 20%²². Since 2015, changes in screening guidelines and new evidence support additional modifications to ADR.

First, an increase in early onset CRC (EOCRC) lead to reductions in the recommended age to start CRC screening to 45 years^{2–4, 63}. To keep the ADR measurement consistent with the currently recommended age to begin screening, we now recommend that ADR be measured in persons age ≥ 45 years rather than 50 years. Since adenoma prevalence is related primarily to age, this change might warrant a downward adjustment in the minimum acceptable threshold. However, recent studies found adenoma prevalence in 45–49 year-olds to be only slightly lower than in 50–54 year-olds^{64–71} (Table 7). Since mean ADRs have been steadily increasing over the past decade⁷², and the proportion of patients undergoing colonoscopy who are in the 45–49 year old age group is still relatively small compared to persons age ≥ 50 years (Table 6), we recommend no adjustment in the minimum acceptable threshold for ADR is warranted for inclusion of 45–49 year olds in the ADR measurement.

Second, several studies reported the incidence of adenomas at a second screening colonoscopy performed 10 years after an initial negative screening colonoscopy^{23, 68, 73–76} (Table 8). Adenoma incidence at 10 years is just slightly below that identified at initial screening colonoscopy, despite patients being 10 years older. In light of this evidence, we recommend that second and subsequent screening colonoscopies can be included in the ADR calculation without adjustment for the minimum acceptable ADR threshold.

Third, as noted above, the original definition of ADR included surveillance (colonoscopy for prior neoplasia) and diagnostic examinations (colonoscopy for symptoms)²⁹. The recommendation to confine the ADR measurement to screening was made in 2006³⁰ because the 2002 targets had been based on screening studies. In this update we recommend expanding the definition of routine ADR to again include both surveillance and diagnostic examinations not performed for positive fecal tests. Given the potential for heterogeneity in adenoma prevalence based on colonoscopy indication, one logical concern is that broadening the ADR calculation to include all surveillance and diagnostic colonoscopies might introduce bias based on patient mix. However, in the aggregate, any bias introduced by heterogeneity is expected to be modest. In general, ADRs for post-polypectomy

surveillance colonoscopies are approximately 7–12% higher than ADR for screening colonoscopies^{22, 67, 77–84} (Table 9), while ADR for diagnostic colonoscopies that do not include significant numbers of positive fecal tests are lower than screening colonoscopy. Thus, a combined ADR including screening, surveillance and non-fecal test diagnostic colonoscopies is often similar to the screening ADR^{82 85}. A modeling study found that a combined ADR stratified endoscopists into high and low detectors as accurately as the screening ADR over a range of indication distributions⁸².

Notably excluded from the routine ADR calculation are colonoscopies performed for positive fecal testing. While ADR is predictive of PCCRC in patients with positive fecal blood tests⁸⁶, ADR consistently runs at least an absolute 15% higher in patients with positive fecal tests^{87–91}. Therefore, positive fecal tests are distinct from other diagnostic indications. The use of fecal testing varies regionally and across health practices in the U.S., and therefore the fraction of colonoscopies performed for positive fecal blood tests is expected to vary substantially across practices. In settings where the proportion of examinations for positive FIT is substantial (as in organized screening programs), and FIT positive evaluations are distributed similarly across endoscopists, FIT positive examinations can be included in the general calculation of ADR for purposes of internal comparisons of endoscopists⁹². However, inclusion of fecal positive tests in the general ADR calculation makes comparison of ADRs across U.S. institutions and comparison with international results challenging. Therefore, we recommend that ADR in FIT positive patients usually be measured separately (see below). Further, if detection performance is measured in inpatients, it is reasonable to exclude patients from ADR and all other detection measures when the indication would not be reasonably expected to include polyp resection (e.g. colonoscopy for acute major lower GI hemorrhage or colonic decompression).

Finally, multiple reports indicate ADRs have risen steadily over the past decade^{70, 93, 94}. In a large registry, mean screening ADR in U.S. gastroenterology practices had risen to 38% by 2018⁷⁰. In a 2014 study, the risk of PCCRC and fatal PCCRC were shown to decrease by 3% and 5%, respectively, for each 1% increase in ADR.²² In a subsequent study, this relationship between ADR and PCCRC was shown to hold during the interval 2010–2018, when ADRs were generally higher, and the relationship extended to ADRs above 40%⁹³. Further, the relationship holds for colonoscopy performed for non-screening indications^{92,93}. Improvements in ADR in U.S. gastroenterology practices likely reflect the emphasis on quality measurement over the past two decades, plus the widespread availability of high definition colonoscopes.

Given the various considerations outlined above, we recommend that ADR calculations include screening, surveillance and diagnostic colonoscopy, but exclude the indications of positive non-colonoscopy screening test [e.g., fecal blood test, multi-target stool DNA (mt-sDNA), CT colonography], therapeutic procedures for resection or treatment of known neoplasia, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, and IBD. Specific recommendations for ADR in patients with positive fecal screening tests are discussed below.

Considering that ADR has risen progressively in screening populations⁷², and that inclusion of surveillance procedures may raise ADR by a significant extent for some colonoscopists,

we now recommend a minimum threshold of 35% for ADR (40% in men and 30% in women). We acknowledge that the actual level of ADR chosen as the minimum acceptable threshold (and therefore the fraction of endoscopists who are below the chosen threshold) carries an arbitrary element, but the considerations outlined above support this recommendation.

Colonoscopists with ADRs below 35% are recommended to undertake remedial measures to improve and to achieve acceptable performance. Because there is evidence that PCCRC risk continues to fall as ADRs move above 35%, we also recommend that all colonoscopists strive to achieve ADRs well above the minimum recommended threshold of 35%, and indeed ADRs can rise well above 40%^{70, 93–97}.

Including more colonoscopies in the ADR measurement has potential advantages and disadvantages. Expanding the included indications results in a larger sample size allowing benchmarking of a higher proportion of the practitioner's colonoscopies. With a higher number of included colonoscopies, the confidence interval is narrower, and performance conclusions are more accurate, which is particularly useful for low volume endoscopists⁹⁸. The evidence that ADR predicts the risk of PCCRC after non-screening examinations^{22, 93 92} and also in patients with positive fecal blood tests⁸⁶ supports measuring performance across a wider range of colonoscopy indications. Adding more examinations to the ADR measurement however, requires more resources to review and record pathology results, particularly if the process is performed manually. Automatic data extraction eliminates this issue but is frequently not available.

For all measures related to lesion detection, we recommend (if feasible and practical in the context of local measurement programs) excluding examinations where the procedure is aborted during insertion because of inadequate preparation, or the examination is complete to the cecum but is rescheduled within 1 year. In both cases, we recommend photo documentation of poor preparation to support the need for repeat examination. We also recommend exclusion of procedures that are incomplete to the cecum or an ileo-colic anastomosis because of abnormal colonic anatomy (e.g., marked redundancy or severe sigmoid angulation and narrowing).

ADR in patients with positive fecal screening tests

5. Percentage of patients with positive fecal screening tests (fecal blood or mt-sDNA) with one or more conventional adenomas resected and documented by pathology

Strength of recommendation: 1C

Performance target: $\geq 50\%$

Measure type: outcome

We continue to recommend exclusion of colonoscopies for positive fecal screening tests from the routine ADR calculation as discussed above. This exclusion is partly because the fraction of colonoscopies performed for positive fecal screening tests varies widely. The fraction is often low in US centers where opportunistic screening is performed and can be

substantially higher in healthcare systems with organized FIT based screening⁹⁹. Thus, and because ADR is higher in these patients, exclusion of positive fecal screening test from routine ADR calculations allows better comparison of ADR across healthcare systems.

There will be instances where the number of colonoscopies performed for positive fecal screening tests is sufficiently high to warrant measurement of ADR within this patient group. ADR in the FIT positive population does predict PCCRC risk⁸⁶. The prevalence of adenomas in FIT positive patients is well documented and can reach as high as 70%¹⁰⁰. ADR is higher when the cut off level of hemoglobin per gram feces for a positive test is higher¹⁰⁰. Like the primary screening population, adenoma prevalence in men with positive FIT is typically 10–15% higher than women¹⁰⁰. In the US, a cut-off of 20 µg hemoglobin per gram feces is often used in FIT assays¹⁰⁰.

Based on available evidence, we recommend an ADR of 50% (55% in men and 45% in women) in FIT positive populations where assays with cut-off of 20 mcg hemoglobin per gm feces are used. There is less evidence about expected ADR in patients with mt-sDNA test positive^{88, 101–104}. Although evidence is limited, we currently recommend the same threshold for ADR in mts-DNA positive patients as for FIT positive patients.

Adenomas per colonoscopy (APC)

6. Number of conventional adenomas detected per colonoscopy in patients age $\geq$ 45 years with indications of screening, surveillance, or diagnosis of symptoms. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, IBD, or undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms are excluded from the calculation.

Strength of recommendation: 2C

Performance Target: ≥ 0.6

Measure type: outcome

The ADR has strengths and weaknesses as a quality indicator. Strengths include that it is a total colon measure, that differentiation of conventional adenomas from lesions in the serrated category by pathologists is generally straightforward with limited interobserver variation¹⁰⁵, and that ADR is validated as a predictor of PCCRC¹⁰⁶. A principal weakness of ADR is that it does not reward detection of additional adenomas after the first adenoma has been identified and resected, and many patients have multiple adenomas. This shortcoming has led to measures such as adenomas per colonoscopy (APC), which rewards detection and resection of each adenoma. Like ADR, higher APC has been associated with lower risk of PCCRC¹⁰⁷.

In general, the correlation between ADR and APC is high^{108–111}. Despite this correlation, there are documented instances in which adequate ADR has been associated with low APC in important fractions of endoscopists^{110, 112}. For example, in one study 47.6% of endoscopists in the lowest quartile of APC performance had ADR $\geq 25\%$, while none of the endoscopists in the highest quartile of APC performance had ADR $< 25\%$ ¹¹⁰. Based on these features, we recommend that APC can be considered as an alternative to

ADR in practices where ADRs are generally high, and endoscopists are seeking additional information that can identify and discriminate suboptimal performance. In this regard a minimum threshold for APC of 0.6 is recommended^{106, 108–111, 113, 114}, but levels above 1.2 are achievable⁹⁶. APC may not provide additional important information when ADR is low.

The major downside of APC is the potential for a perceived incentive to separate adenomas into separate preservative bottles for pathologic examination. Such a practice would increase costs, and is not recommended to improve the accuracy of tabulating APC. An alternative approach is to record the number of individual adenomas detected and photographed in the procedure report. The photographs serve to support the total number of adenomas identified in the colonoscopy procedure. This approach could be used as an alternative way of counting ADR or APC with a “resect and discard” strategy. In the absence of resect and discard practice, however, photography can still be used to document the number of adenomas identified so that submission of adenomas in separate bottles is minimized¹¹⁵.

Sessile serrated lesion detection rate (priority indicator)

7. Percentage of patients age ≥ 45 years undergoing screening, surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy for symptoms with one or more sessile serrated lesions removed and documented by pathology. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, IBD, or undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms are excluded from the calculation.

Strength of recommendation: 2C

Performance target: $\geq 6\%$

Measure type: outcome

The ASGE/ACG Quality Task Force on colonoscopy committee considered carefully and at length whether to add a detection target directed toward serrated lesions. A survey found that many US endoscopists are still not measuring ADR¹¹⁶. Adding a separate indicator for detection of serrated lesions creates an additional measurement and resource burden for endoscopists and endoscopy units. Further, there are unique challenges associated with implementation of any serrated indicator that are not relevant to ADR. First, there is substantial interobserver variation among pathologists in the diagnosis of sessile serrated lesion (SSL) versus hyperplastic polyps (HPs)^{117–120}. This is not an issue in the pathologic diagnosis of conventional adenomas³¹. Second, a serrated indicator should ideally disincentivize the identification and resection of diminutive distal colon hyperplastic polyps, which are generally considered to not be precancerous¹²¹. However, an indicator that relies on endoscopist localization during colonoscopy could be subject to bias and gaming in prospective use¹⁰⁶. Third, some measures of serrated detection have utilized polyp size¹²². These measurements would be subject to substantial endoscopist bias and gaming in prospective use. Despite these cautionary notes, 3 recent studies found that ADR is insufficient as a sole detection indicator predicting PCCRC^{122–124}. In two trials, ADR detection above 25% and low serrated lesion detection were found in 13–14% of endoscopists^{123 124}, and another 37–45% of endoscopists had ADR below 25% and low

serrated detection. In both studies the correlation between ADR and serrated detection was moderate^{123,124}.

Although a variety of serrated detection indicators have been proposed¹⁰⁶, the committee considered 3 because of their association with PCCRC in recent studies^{122, 123} (clinically significant serrated polyp, proximal serrated polyp, and SSL detection rates), and we recommend the SSL detection rate (SSLDR) as the quality indicator of choice, because it directly measures the precancerous serrated lesion of greatest interest, and is not subject to endoscopist bias (Table 10).

We acknowledge that SSLDR is subject to measurement and accuracy error related to pathologist interobserver variation in differentiation of SSL from HP^{117–120}. Thus, there is a chance that SSLDR will reflect pathologist performance and bias rather than endoscopist performance in some instances¹¹⁸. This is a potentially serious flaw in endoscopy detection measures¹⁰⁶. However, there is evidence that SSL detection is increasing rapidly with time¹²⁵, and that part of this increase reflects improved awareness and education among community pathologists of identification of SSL. Further, introducing SSLDR as a detection target should incentivize endoscopists to work with their pathologists to improve pathologic identification of SSLs¹²⁶. Admittedly, any serrated detection indicator carries inherent flaws for prospective use¹⁰⁶.

To set the target threshold for minimum SSLDR, we examined prevalence data on SSL as well as the association of SSL detection with PCCRC. A systematic review and meta-analysis found a pooled SSL prevalence of 2.5%¹²⁷. The reported prevalence of SSLs varies between countries and the pooled prevalence in the US was found to be 4.6%¹²⁸. However, there is clear evidence of increasing SSL prevalence over time¹²⁵, with both endoscopist and pathology factors contributing to the increase. A registry study from the US involving more than 5.1 million colonoscopies and 3934 endoscopists found that the prevalence of 4.57% in 2014 increased to 7.14% in 2017¹²⁵. Thus, the prevalence of SSLs as determined by colonoscopic detection is steadily rising.

Data suggest SSLDR may not correlate closely with ADR, and that SSLDR provides predictive data independent from ADR, making it a worthy stand-alone quality indicator. A recent study from the Netherlands performed in FIT positive patients showed that the proximal serrated polyp detection rate (PSPDR) and the SSLDR had similar associations with prevention of PCCRC¹²³. In a study from Austria, the magnitude of PCCRC mortality reduction was similar for increases in PSPDR and SSLDR, but the effect on mortality reduction did not reach significance for SSLDR, probably because SSLs are less prevalent than PSPs¹²⁴. Greater prevalence is an advantage for PSPDR as a detection measure compared to SSLDR, but it should be recalled that over half of patients with serrated polyps have them only in the distal colon¹²⁴, which could subject PSPDR to gaming with prospective use. Data from the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry also demonstrate that SSL detection predicts PCCRC independent of ADR¹²⁹. The unadjusted risks of PCCRC were 1.4%, 0.6%, 0.6%, 0.4% and 0.3% with SSLDRs of < 1.0 %, 1-<2.0%, 2.0-<4.0%, 4.0-<6.0% and ≥ 6.0%, respectively. Approximately one-third of endoscopists had adequate ADR but SSLDR <6% (33.8%;50/148).

One challenge with SSLDR is that the prevalence of SSLs is lower than that of conventional adenomas, so that substantial procedure volumes will be required for some physicians to determine with confidence if detection is clearly adequate or suboptimal. This same issue impacts the reliability of ADR measurement⁹⁸, but does not negate the value of measurement. It seems reasonable to report SSLDR to colonoscopists, with the expectation the confidence interval around SSLDR will narrow with continued measurement. Assessment and reporting of SSLDR performance over longer time periods than used for ADR may be appropriate.

Based on available evidence, we recommend a current minimum threshold for SSLDR of 6%. There is an expectation this will be revised upward as evidence of increasing detection occurs. Although evidence is limited, we consider that an SSLDR in fecal immunochemical test (FIT) positive patients of 6% (same target recommended for SSLDR in general population measurement) is appropriate, as there is a little evidence that FIT detects serrated lesions, and few data on the yield of serrated lesions in FIT positive patients¹³⁰. Mt-sDNA does detect some serrated lesions based on methylation markers included in the test, but an appropriate target for SSLDR in this population is currently uncertain. One recent study found a 20.5% prevalence of SSLs in mt-sDNA positive patients¹³¹.

We recommend that as groups of endoscopists using the same pathology service begin measuring SSLDR they review the range of SSLDRs across the endoscopy group relative to ADRs. If SSLDRs are low across the entire group, particularly in the setting of adequate ADRs, review of SSL diagnosis with group endoscopists and/or local pathologists is needed.

Withdrawal time

8. Average withdrawal time in normal colonoscopies without biopsies or polypectomies in persons age ≥ 45 years undergoing screening, surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, IBD, or undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms are excluded from the calculation.

Strength of recommendation: 2A

Performance target: ≥ 8 minutes

Measure type: process

The recommended minimum average withdrawal time in normal colonoscopies without polypectomy, biopsy, or therapy reflects the best evidence available regarding the time most colonoscopists need to apply careful and detailed inspection of the colon, from the appendiceal orifice to completion of retroflexion in the rectum. The first recommendation for withdrawal time made in 2002²⁹ recommended an average of 6–10 minutes in normal colonoscopies, based on the observation of two physicians participating in a miss rate study who had mean withdrawal times of 8 minutes and the lowest observed miss rates among 26 endoscopists in the study¹³². In 2006, the recommendation for minimum average withdrawal time was changed to 6 minutes³⁰ on the basis of a landmark study showing that in a group of private practice gastroenterologists performing colonoscopy, 6 minutes of withdrawal time in normal colonoscopies was associated with reasonable separation between high and low level

detectors²⁶. Since 2006, but particularly since 2015, considerable evidence has demonstrated that optimal detection typically requires at least 8–9 minutes average withdrawal time in normal colonoscopies^{26, 133–148} (Table 1). This evidence includes retrospective data showing that prevention of PCCRC is optimized at withdrawal times of at least 8–9 minutes¹⁴⁹. Observational studies suggest that overall detection of adenomas is optimized at 8–9 minutes or longer^{26, 133–148} (Table 11), as is detection of serrated lesions^{136, 139, 143}. A parallel design randomized trial comparing 6 to 9 minutes found 9 minutes to be superior for detection¹⁴⁷, as did a randomized tandem study comparing adenoma miss rates at 9 minutes versus 6 minutes¹⁴⁸.

Importantly, withdrawal time is not by itself an adequate measure of detection performance or skill. Rather, the primary measures of detection performance are ADR and SSLDR. Withdrawal time cannot substitute for ADR or SSLDR. Withdrawal time should be measured and recorded in clinical practice, and if ADR or SSLDR are low, an accompanying short withdrawal time suggests inadequate withdrawal technique. Corrective measures designed to improve ADR and SSLDR should focus on optimized examination technique, which consists of systematic attempts to expose the mucosa proximal to each haustral fold, flexure, and valve in the colorectum, achieving adequate distention of the colon, and intraprocedural cleansing to expose mucosal surfaces covered by fluid collections, bubbles or particulate debris^{150, 151}. The point is that application of high-quality inspection techniques requires an average of at least 8–9 minutes.

There is some evidence that mucosal exposure devices (specifically Endocuff Vision; Olympus America Corporation, Center Valley, PA) can allow faster examination during withdrawal without compromising detection¹⁵². Additional study of this concept is needed.

The recommendation that the average minimum withdrawal time should be at least 8–9 minutes in normal colonoscopies should not be translated to mean that best practice or the standard of medical care requires that every withdrawal time should last ≥ 8 minutes. On the other hand, if ADR and/or SSLDR are below minimum recommended threshold and accompanied by an average minimum withdrawal time of < 8 minutes, this could be construed as evidence of inadequate withdrawal technique. Thus, low ADR accompanied by short average withdrawal time should be considered an indication to evaluate and correct inspection technique.

Resection Indicators

Documentation of lesion features and resection method indicator

9. Percentage of polyp resections for which the report documents the lesion size, shape, location and method of resection

Strength of recommendation: 3

Performance target: $\geq 98\%$

Measure type: process

Use of cold snare for 4–9 mm lesions

10. Percentage of 4–9 mm lesions that are resected using a cold snare

Strength of recommendation: 1A

Performance target: $\geq 90\%$

Measure type: process

The U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer (MSTF)¹⁵³ and the ESGE¹⁵⁴ have created detailed recommendations for the resection of colorectal neoplasms. These recommendations cover the assessment and resection of the full range of colorectal neoplasms, including assessment and characterization of neoplasia, selection of resection methods, and optimal methodology for resection. Herein, we focus on quality measurement.

The writing committee considered a range of potential quality indicators for resection and now recommends two indicators that are characterized by feasibility of measurement, evidence of variable practice, and/or agreement among expert endoscopists regarding best practice. Both have substantial clinical relevance.

The first indicator asks that colonoscopists report for all polyps their size, shape, location in the colon by segment (or distance in cm from the anus for left colon polyps), and the method of removal (i.e. cold snare, cold forceps, hot snare, hot forceps, cold endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR), hot EMR, etc.), though we note that hot forceps play no role in colorectal neoplasia resection except for avulsion during hot EMR or the removal of flat polyp overlying fibrosis in the case of a recurrence or a previously partly resected polyp.

Size: Size is an important parameter to record as it drives surveillance. The use of terms such as “small” is discouraged. Terminal digit rounding¹⁵⁵ is discouraged, and polyps ≥ 10 mm in size should be photographed with a snare of known size fully opened and placed over and against the polyp¹⁵³. Smaller polyps can be photographed using the same technique or placing the tip of the snare sheath (diameter 2.4 mm) up against the polyp base. Polyps in the same colorectal segment can be recorded with a range of sizes and shapes (e.g., 4 flat and sessile polyps 2–4 mm in size removed by cold snare). Polyps ≥ 10 mm should be described individually. If multiple polyps ≥ 10 mm are removed from the same section and by the same method, with similar histologic predictions, they may be grouped together in the report. Certainly, any lesion, irrespective of size, that suggests advanced histology or endoscopic features of cancer (submucosal invasion or deeper) based on morphology or pit pattern analysis should be individually submitted for pathology; and not combined in the same bottle as polyps from different segments.

Shape: With regard to polyp shape, the Paris classification is recommended¹⁵⁶. Use of the terms “sessile”, “flat” and “pedunculated” is also acceptable. From the perspective of management of unexpected malignancy, the most important distinction is between pedunculated and non-pedunculated, since the histologic features that drive the decision for adjuvant surgical therapy vary slightly between these groups¹⁵⁷. Interobserver agreement in differentiation of Paris IIa from Is lesions is poor, and by extension so is the differentiation of “flat” from “sessile”¹⁵⁸. Regardless, careful assessment of polyps for these features helps

emphasize the extreme subtlety of many lesions, and therefore the need for very careful inspection of the entire colorectum. Lateral spreading lesions, which grow laterally along the colon wall for > 1 cm, can be described by their specific morphology^{153 154}. Accurate assessment of morphology, together with colorectal location (colon vs rectum), can guide decisions regarding piecemeal vs en bloc resection^{153 154}.

Location: Polyp location should be recorded as it facilitates identification of polyp resection scars at surveillance, is essential when malignancy is suspected or reported unexpectedly, and is important to identify serrated polyposis syndrome.

Resection method: Reporting the resection method is essential. Resection methods, particularly in the use and type of cautery, differ in their complication rates. Resection methods also differ in rates of completeness and recurrence, with forceps associated with higher incomplete resection rates of lesions > 3mm and cold EMR having higher recurrence rates for adenomas ≥ 20 mm in size¹⁵⁹. Clip placement to treat or prevent hemorrhage is associated with artifacts at follow-up examination¹⁶⁰. Clip artifacts can be accurately distinguished from residual polyp by high definition imaging¹⁶¹, but confirmation of clip artifact is made easier by an accurate initial report of clip placement. Thus, all therapeutic steps of lesion resection should be described in the procedure report including naming all specific devices and whether each resection step employed electrocautery.

The second quality of resection indicator recommended is the percentage of lesions 4–9 mm in size removed by cold snare polypectomy. The first principle guiding the optimal resection of lesions in this size range is the extremely low risk of submucosally invasive cancer, which has decreased over time in successive publications¹⁶². The advantage of cold over hot resection is the near elimination of perforation and delayed hemorrhage^{163–166}, which seems important for a set of lesions that are unlikely to harm patients in the near term. Indeed, the prevalence of adenomas is much higher than the lifetime risk of CRC, so that most patients having adenomas will never develop cancer. This is an important rationale for resecting lesions with minimal risk of harm. Cold snare resection is associated with a more superficial resection plane than hot snare resection^{167, 168}, which may underlie the higher risk of residual polyp when cold EMR is used to remove large adenomas¹⁵⁹. However, randomized trials indicate complete resection rates using cold snaring for lesions < 10 mm are comparable to hot snaring^{169–176}. Accurate technique and snare placement are more important than the use of specialty thin wire vs standard snares¹⁷⁷. The indicator excludes lesions < 4 mm, because evidence indicates that cold forceps and cold snaring are comparably effective for lesions up to 3 mm in size^{178–184}, and some practitioners prefer cold forceps. However, cold forceps are less effective than cold snaring for lesions > 3mm in size^{178–184}. Thus, cold snaring is the technique of choice for lesions 4–9 mm in size. Pedunculated lesions in this size range can also be removed safely and effectively by cold snaring^{185, 186}. Despite this, many endoscopists use cold forceps for lesions > 3 mm in size, indicating there is both substantial evidence of variable practice with regard to resection technique for lesions 4–9 mm, and considerable room for improvement. Many patients have one or more lesions ≤ 3 mm and one or more lesions 4–9 mm in size. Use of cold snaring for

the entire range of lesions < 10 mm in size saves the use of cold forceps and reduces plastic waste associated with colonoscopy¹⁸⁷.

Inadequate lesion resection and variation in resection quality are major issues in colonoscopy quality. The committee encourages developing internal institutional programs that evaluate resection performance utilizing polypectomy assessment tools and provide periodic feedback to endoscopists. Detailed evaluation of PCCRC suggests that a significant minority of PCCRCs result from ineffective resection of advanced lesions^{188–190}. Biopsy of the margins of lesions that appeared to be completely resected showed that residual neoplasia may still be present, and that the risk is operator dependent. Efficacy of complete resection varied by 3-fold among operators in one study¹⁹¹. Assessment of competency of resection by blinded review of video recordings found that assessed competency also varied 3-fold, with some operators having rates of competent resection as low as 30%, and no correlation between ADR and competency of resection³³. The best approach to assess resection competency is through real-time assessment by a monitor, or by expert review of video recordings. Two scales have been validated for this purpose, including the Direct Observation of Polypectomy Skills (DOPyS)¹⁹² and the simpler and shorter Cold Snare Polypectomy Assessment Tool (CSPAT)¹⁹³ for the assessment of cold snare technique only. The writing committee of the ASGE/ACG Task Force considered that a broad recommendation to systematically evaluate all U.S. endoscopists with these tools would be challenging to implement, since videorecording is not widely available in the U.S., and the practice of real time monitoring would be viewed as costly and impractical by many centers. Nonetheless, we encourage endoscopy centers to invest in recording equipment that can be used in monitoring of both inspection and resection quality.

In its last recommendations, the ASGE/ACG Task Force recommended that quality monitoring evaluate the fraction of non-pedunculated lesions < 2 cm that are referred for surgical resection as a quality indicator³¹. This general topic is still appropriate for review in quality programs, though the method of audit can be challenging, and we are not including this indicator in this update. Endoscopic resection is the preferred method over surgical resection for all benign colorectal neoplasms regardless of size, shape or location with the possible exception of lesions invading the appendiceal orifice for which the entire margin cannot be exposed during colonoscopy¹⁵³. Endoscopic resection of benign neoplasms is associated with lower morbidity and mortality and lower costs than surgical resection^{194–198}. If feasible, one approach is to collaborate with the local pathology department to review the pathology of all surgical colorectal resections and determine whether a local issue of inappropriate referral of benign lesions for surgery exists.

Post-procedure indicators

Use of appropriate screening and surveillance intervals (priority indicator)

11. Frequency with which colonoscopies follow recommended post-polypectomy and post-cancer resection surveillance intervals, and frequency of 10-year intervals between screening colonoscopies in average risk patients who have negative examination results and adequate bowel cleansing

Strength of recommendation: 1C

Performance target: $\geq 90\%$

Type of measure: Process

Optimal performance of colonoscopy means it is both effective in preventing CRC and cost-effective. Optimal results can be achieved through optimized detection and resection of neoplasia during the procedure, followed by continued screening or surveillance using evidence-based intervals. Currently negative screening colonoscopy should be followed by repeat examinations at an interval of 10 years¹. Shorter intervals for screening are appropriate only if there is an inadequate bowel preparation (in case of inadequate preparation, a repeat colonoscopy with adequate preparation should be performed within 1 year), or if patients have a high risk family history defined as multiple first degree relatives with CRC or advanced lesions or a first degree relative with CRC or an advanced precancerous lesion at age < 60 years, for which a 5 year interval is appropriate¹. Current recommendations for post-polypectomy surveillance³² and post CRC resection⁵³ in the U.S. are summarized in documents from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force. Performing high quality colonoscopy that optimizes benefit, minimizes harms, and maximizes cost-effectiveness, includes an obligation to know and follow these recommendations for screening and surveillance intervals.

Non-adherence with guidelines for screening and surveillance intervals has been a long-standing issue^{199–209}. A recent meta-analysis found that 17 to 25.7% of screening colonoscopies are performed more frequently than indicated or without an adequate indication for early repeat¹⁹⁹. In community practice, there is substantial overuse of surveillance colonoscopy among low-risk subjects and underuse among subjects with high-risk precancerous lesions^{199–204}. Modeling indicates that surveillance contributes to reductions in CRC incidence, and that surveillance is cost-effective, including high intensity surveillance in high risk patients²¹⁰. Reasons for nonadherence to polyp surveillance guidelines have been surveyed^{205–208}. Rationales reported for overuse include the perception that patients have risk factors not addressed by guidelines, lack of guideline knowledge, a fear of missed neoplasia, and lack of confidence about the strength of underlying research supporting recommendations^{205–208}. However, the evidence supporting current recommendations is substantial³², and US recommendations include shorter and thus more aggressive intervals than those used elsewhere in the world, which are based on review of the same evidence^{211, 212}. Posters summarizing the post-polypectomy recommendations are available for placement in the endoscopy unit³². Clinical decision support tools have been shown to improve adherence with guideline recommendations^{213, 214}.

Adverse Events

12. Frequency of serious adverse events (perforation, post-polypectomy bleeding, and mortality) associated with colonoscopy are tracked, documented, and reviewed by a quality improvement committee to assess for system and clinical areas of improvement.

Strength of recommendation: 1C

Performance target: $\geq 95\%$

Measure type: Process

Adverse events in colonoscopy span a range of outcomes. For colonoscopy, serious adverse events (SAEs) include perforation, post-polypectomy bleeding, cardiovascular events related to sedation, unplanned hospitalization, and mortality²¹⁵. SAEs are reported to be under 1% across large integrated healthcare delivery systems²¹⁶. In a large integrated healthcare organization in Washington State, SAEs (perforation, bleeding, myocardial infarction, stroke, splenic injury) within 30 days after colonoscopy fluctuated between 0.2 (myocardial infarction) and 0.8 (perforation) per 1,000 screening colonoscopies and between 0.4 (myocardial infarction) and 1.1 (bleeding) per 1,000 follow-up colonoscopies²¹⁷. Most serious non-gastrointestinal post-colonoscopy events are expected based on background event rates, and not attributable to the colonoscopy²¹⁸.

Endoscopy units must identify, track, and document SAEs related to colonoscopy. While some events can be immediately identified, other events may not be evident until after discharge from the endoscopy unit. Strategies to capture delayed SAEs include using pre-defined billing codes or natural language processing within an electronic health medical record (EMR), in some cases across multiple healthcare systems. A second, and more common modality, is a post-procedure phone call. Several regulatory bodies, such as The Joint Commission require a phone call within 48 hours of a procedure with anesthesia support²¹⁹; at the same time, there is no guidance on procedures where moderate/deep sedation is employed. While the optimal timing and frequency of these phone calls is not clearly defined and is impacted by many factors such as staffing resources, endoscopy units should achieve a 98% rate of attempting to call patients within 72 hours of their colonoscopy. Finally, SAEs can have devastating consequences for patients, providers, and healthcare teams. Consequently, when they occur, a focused approach should be utilized to review, analyze, and develop interventions to help prevent or minimize such events from occurring in the future. An appropriate and recommended response to SAEs requires: 1) investigation, 2) comprehensive systematic review, 3) convening a group to conduct a root cause analysis (RCA) for identifying contributory factors, 4) develop corrective actions in areas where improvement can be made to prevent future events and 5) implement system improvements or education/remediation^{220–223}.

Perforation can occur during or soon after colonoscopy with over half diagnosed by the endoscopist²²⁴. About 5% of perforations associated with colonoscopy are fatal^{225–227}. Perforation is most common in the cecum and sigmoid colon^{228–230}. Common etiologies are barotrauma, direct mechanical injury through endoscope advancement or dilation, and thermal/electrical injury during a therapeutic maneuver^{228, 231}. Perforation in screening examinations is lower with a reported incidence of 0.04%²³²; increases to 0.016–0.8% for diagnostic colonoscopies²³³ and 0.02–8% for therapeutic colonoscopies²³³. Patients with diverticulosis²³⁴ and irritable bowel syndrome (IBD)^{235, 236} as well as those taking corticosteroids are at increased risk of perforation. Non-gastroenterologists performing colonoscopy²³⁷ and lower volume endoscopists^{238, 239} are associated with higher perforation rates. Polypectomy²³³ with electrocautery increases the risk of perforation²⁴⁰.

Not exerting force with the endoscope against fixed resistance, removing loops, using a flexible instrument (e.g., pediatric colonoscope or upper endoscope) in narrowed sigmoid colons, using cold snare polypectomy instead of cautery in the resection of diminutive polyps^{164, 176, 240–242}, insufflation with carbon dioxide²⁴³, and submucosal injection during EMR²⁴⁴ decrease perforation risk. Endoscopists who recognize a perforation during the procedure should attempt closure with through the scope clips²⁴⁵ or large clips that are mounted over the end of the endoscope²⁴⁶. All perforations should be monitored by the endoscopy unit medical director and reviewed by a quality improvement committee. This approach can lead to changes in processes and opportunities for endoscopist education which can improve practices that reduce future risk.

Bleeding is the most common adverse event of polypectomy^{226, 247, 248}. Bleeding can be immediate (during the procedure) or delayed (after release from the endoscopy unit). Risk factors include polyps > 1 cm in size^{248–250}, high number of polyps removed^{251–253}, proximal colon location^{254, 255}, certain comorbidities^{253, 256}, and antiplatelet and/or anticoagulant medications²⁵¹. Older observational data on bleeding rates using fixed power output generators found that low-power coagulation current was associated with increased delayed bleeding and less immediate, with cutting or blended current associated with more immediate and less delayed bleeding^{257, 258}. A randomized trial of forced coagulation current vs. the alternating cut-coagulation current Endocut (ERBE, Stuttgart, Baden-Wurttemberg, Germany) using microprocessor-controlled generators found similar rates of delayed bleeding and higher rates of immediate bleeding with Endocut²⁵⁹. Endoscopists should follow guidelines for managing anticoagulant/antiplatelet medications prior to and after colonoscopy^{260, 261}. Cold snare polypectomy for small polyps (under 9 mm) reduces delayed hemorrhage^{164, 176, 241, 242, 262}. Prophylactic clipping of resection sites should be performed when feasible for lesions over 2 cm located proximal to the splenic flexure which were removed using electrocautery (all 3 criteria fulfilled)^{263, 264}. Delayed hemorrhages requiring hospitalization, transfusion, repeat endoscopic or radiographic or surgical procedures for control of bleeding warrant review of polypectomy technique, appropriate use prophylactic measures and other related case aspects.

Immediate bleeding should be treated by endoscopic means and rarely require interventional radiology or operative treatment. Delayed bleeding frequently stops spontaneously²⁶⁵. In-hospital observation is appropriate if there is ongoing bleeding, or if the patient has comorbidities, resides far away, or has transportation challenges. Repeat colonoscopy is optional in patients in whom bleeding has ceased. Patients continuing to demonstrate overt gastrointestinal bleeding (i.e., hematochezia or melena) require prompt repeat colonoscopy²⁶⁵. Treatment can be by clip application or epinephrine injection in combination with multipolar cautery^{265, 266}. Repeat post-polypectomy bleeding is rare once it has stopped spontaneously or has been treated with endoscopic therapy.

Most deaths directly attributable to colonoscopy are cardiopulmonary events related to anesthesia/sedation²¹⁵. While all-cause mortality within 30 days of colonoscopy occurs in 0.07% of patients, nearly all deaths are linked to underlying comorbidities such as cardiopulmonary disease, cirrhosis, and/or neurologic diseases²¹⁵. Any death after colonoscopy warrants a detailed investigation and review by the institution's quality

committee to ascertain underlying causes, determine if the death was preventable, and what improvements can be implemented moving forward.

Quality indicators for colonoscopy in Inflammatory Bowel Disease

Inflammatory Bowel Disease Intra-Procedure Colonoscopy Indicators

Ulcerative Colitis disease activity score

13. Percentage of colonoscopies performed for the indication ulcerative colitis in which a formal assessment of disease extent and activity [MES (Mayo Endoscopic Score), MMES (Modified Mayo Endoscopic Score), UCEIS (Ulcerative Colitis Endoscopic Index of Severity) or UCCIS (Ulcerative Colitis Colonoscopic Index of Severity)] is recorded

Strength of recommendation: 3

Performance target: $\geq 90\%$

Measure type: process

Documenting the extent and severity of endoscopic inflammation in the colon in patients with ulcerative colitis (UC) is essential in the classification of disease severity, prognosis, and risk for future development of colorectal neoplasia²⁶⁷. In general, the endoscopic extent of disease correlates with patient reported outcomes, laboratory tests and prognosis. In addition, disease extent and severity are important factors when choosing medical therapy. The report can specify the extent by description of involved segments, or use the Montreal classification to document extent of disease²⁶⁸. In the Montreal system, endoscopic disease limited to the rectum is E1, left-sided colitis E2, and any disease proximal to the splenic flexure E3.

Endoscopic disease activity correlates with prognosis and risk of developing colorectal neoplasia. Objective markers of endoscopic disease activity are needed as symptoms often do not correlate with endoscopic findings. In 2021, the International Organization for the Study of Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IOIBD) updated recommendations for treatment targets in adult patients with IBD²⁶⁹. Mucosal healing is now an important clinical target associated with long-term clinical remission, avoidance of colectomy, and corticosteroid-free clinical remission²⁷⁰. In UC endoscopic assessment can be performed via sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy.

Several scoring systems are available to grade endoscopic disease activity²⁷¹. The Mayo endoscopic subscore (MES) first reported in 1987²⁷² is easily implemented in clinical practice and although not validated, is commonly used and accepted by the FDA. Several mucosal findings comprise the MES including erythema, assessment of vascular pattern, and presence of friability, spontaneous bleeding, erosions, or ulcerations. Scores range between 0 and 3. A modified Mayo endoscopic score (MMES) was introduced in 2015 to quantify the extent of colonic involvement²⁷³. In the MMES, the colon is divided into 5 segments, and the score for each segment is added to give a modified score, which is multiplied by maximal extent of inflammation and divided by the number of segments with active

inflammation. The MMES correlates with clinical, biologic, and histologic activity and allows a better assessment of partial healing but is not validated.

An alternative endoscopic scoring system for UC first developed in 2012 is the Ulcerative Colitis Endoscopic Index of Severity or UCEIS^{274, 275}. Three endoscopic findings comprise the 8 point scale and include assessment of the vascular pattern^{267, 268}, presence of bleeding^{267–270}, erosions/ulcers^{267, 268} scored in the most severely affected part of the colon. Friability is not a component of the UCEIS. The UCEIS is validated, has satisfactory interobserver agreement, is responsive to treatment effects and able to predict medium to long-term outcomes of patients in clinical remission.

The Ulcerative Colitis Colonoscopic Index of Severity (UCCIS) was developed in 2013 and is calculated by evaluating segmental scores using 4 different variables including granularity, vascular pattern, ulceration, and bleeding/friability²⁷⁶. Although validated and with high interobserver agreement, obtaining the final score is complex and may not be simple to use in clinical practice.

Other endoscopic scoring tools are under development to assess mucosal healing²⁷⁷. Video training in the use of scales is available²⁷¹. Training programs have demonstrated improved inter-rater agreement seen with expert endoscopists²⁷⁸.

An MES of 0 and 1 are both associated with positive patient outcomes in treatment trials. In STRIDE II, the MES or UCEIS were recommended to assess endoscopic activity with endoscopic healing defined as MES of 0 and UCEIS ≤ 1 ²⁶⁹.

Crohn's Disease activity score

14. Percentage of colonoscopies performed for the indication Crohn's disease in which a formal disease activity score [CDEIS (Crohn's Disease Endoscopic Index of Severity), SES-CD (Simple Endoscopic Activity Score in Crohn's Disease), or Rutgeerts score] is reported

Strength of recommendation: 3

Performance target: $\geq 90\%$

Type of measure: Process

Investigators have advocated for both symptomatic and endoscopic assessment of Crohn's disease (CD) to best quantify response to therapy. Endoscopic assessment of disease activity is an essential aid to clinical practice. While the Crohn's Disease Endoscopic Index of Severity (CDEIS) and the Simple Endoscopic Score for Crohn's Disease (SES-CD) have been validated, a minimally important clinical change in score has not been defined for either instrument.

The CDEIS was developed in 1989²⁷⁹. Components include nine separate lesions: pseudopolyps, healed ulceration, frank erythema, frankly swollen mucosa, aphthoid ulceration, superficial shallow ulceration, deep ulceration, non-ulcerated stenosis and ulcerated stenosis. CDEIS scoring is relatively complex, with total scores ranging from 0–44 and higher scores denoting worse disease activity. High intraclass correlation coefficients

for intra-rater and inter-rater reliability were observed for total CDEIS scores during index development, 0.96 and 0.86 respectively. In a second study, the intra-rater correlation was 0.89 and interrater was 0.71²⁸⁰. Construct validity of the two ranges from 0.75 to 0.83. Responsiveness has been measured as correlation between changes in mean and global evaluation of disease with a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.72²⁸¹.

The SES-CD was developed to overcome concerns associated with the complexity of CDEIS. The components of the SES-CD include ulcer size, proportion of ulcerated surface, proportion of the surface area affected by any disease lesion, and stenosis²⁸². Each component is graded from 0–3 and a total score is calculated as the sum of the items for all segments of the colon and terminal ileum. The correlation coefficient for intra-rater reliability was 0.91 for CDEIS and 0.98 for the SES-CD²⁸². In a second study, the intra-rater correlation was 0.91²⁸³. The responsiveness to change was evaluated with repeat colonoscopy at an average of four months after baseline, and changes measured by the two indices were highly correlated with an r of 0.83²⁸⁴.

While both scoring systems are widely available for use, the SES-CD is increasingly favored for both eligibility and outcome assessment given its relative simplicity. The BRIDGE (Building Research in Inflammatory Bowel Disease Globally) group used a modified Delphi approach to identify elements of high-quality Inflammatory Bowel Disease endoscopy reporting²⁸⁵. The panel noted that the use of the SES-CD was appropriate in clinical practice although they recognized that the primary advantage was the use of standardized descriptive terminology of endoscopic findings rather than quantitative assessment. The first STRIDE guideline²⁸⁶ recommended absence of ulcers as an adequate endpoint in routine clinical care, but the more recent STRIDE-II guideline endorsed SES-CD. Endoscopic healing is reflected by SES-CD < 3 points or SES-CD ulceration subscore of 0²⁶⁹.

The Rutgeerts score grades early neo-terminal ileal lesions to predict post-surgical outcomes and identify patients for whom therapy escalation may be necessary²⁸⁷. Lesions are graded on a five point scale of increasing severity where a grade of i0 indicates no lesions in the distal ileum, i1 indicates less than five aphthous lesions in the distal ileum, i2 indicates greater than five aphthous lesions in the distal ileum with normal mucosa between lesions or skip areas of larger lesions or lesions confined to the ileocolonic anastomosis, i3 indicates diffuse aphthous ileitis with diffusely inflamed mucosa, and i4 indicates large ulcers with diffuse mucosal inflammation or nodules or stenosis. Endoscopic recurrence is defined as a score of $\geq$ i2. Currently, assessment of the reliability, responsiveness, validity and feasibility of the Rutgeerts score is required but the scale has proven straightforward for clinical practice.

In summary, we recommend the use of a specific scoring system to assess disease activity for both UC and CD. This is essential in optimizing accurate classification of disease severity and determining prognosis and risk of complications. The most used scores based on clinical experience and ease of use are shown in Table 12.

Inflammatory Bowel Disease Post-Colonoscopy Quality Indicators

Ulcerative colitis surveillance colonoscopy interval

15. Frequency of appropriate recommendation for follow-up surveillance colonoscopy interval for ulcerative colitis/indeterminate colitis patients undergoing dysplasia screening without dysplasia detected.

Strength of recommendation: 1C

Performance target: $\geq 90\%$

Type of measure: Process

There is increased risk of CRC in patients with UC and colonic CD²⁸⁸. CRC associated with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) has poorer outcomes compared to sporadic CRC including younger age at onset and worse survival^{289,290}.

Routine surveillance colonoscopies are recommended for IBD patients with colonic disease extending beyond the rectum after 8 years of disease to monitor for development of colonic dysplasia or neoplasia^{288,291, 292,267}. For patients with IBD and concomitant primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC) initiation of surveillance is recommended at time of PSC diagnosis^{288,291,292,267}. However, data supporting clinical, or mortality benefits of such strategies are limited and, the quality of available evidence is low²⁹³.

We recommend that the appropriateness of recommended surveillance intervals be measured after colonoscopy in patients with UC or indeterminate colitis with no dysplasia. The basis for assessing appropriate intervals is presented in Table 13. The recommendations assume an examination of the entire colon with adequate bowel preparation. Though there is uncertainty whether dye-spray or electronic chromoendoscopy add benefit when using a high definition colonoscope, we suggest high definition colonoscopy complemented with one modality of chromoendoscopy with targeted biopsy of suspicious areas^{288,291, 292,267}.

Table 13 presents a compilation of four clinical guidelines or clinical practice updates to develop a summary guidance^{288,291, 292,267}. We considered that the American College of Gastroenterology guideline had a maximum interval of 3 years²⁶⁷ while 3 other guidelines/updates allowed up to 5 years between colonoscopies in select situations^{288,291,292}.

The recommendations are based on known risk factors for IBD-associated CRC including duration of disease, disease extent, age at onset, degree of inflammation, presence of colonic strictures, concomitant PSC, family history of CRC and male gender²⁹⁴. Shorter time intervals are recommended for those with high-risk features while longer time intervals can be recommended for those with limited risk and who have achieved mucosal healing (Table 13).

Correction of poor performance

The primary purpose of measuring colonoscopy quality indicators is to improve patient care through identification of suboptimal performance and implementation of interventions that address deficiencies. Improvement in colonoscopy quality metrics has been documented for bowel preparation quality, polyp detection and resection, and adherence to surveillance

recommendation^{295–300}. Improvement in ADR is associated with a reduced risk of PCCRC and cancer-related death³⁰¹.

Though a full discussion of approaches to improve colonoscopy quality is beyond the scope of this document, key principles are discussed. Optimal adenoma detection depends upon adequate bowel preparation, withdrawal technique that maximizes mucosal exposure, high-level recognition of even subtle neoplasia and complete resection of precancerous lesions. A critical first step in colonoscopy quality assurance is the audit and feedback of individual physician performance, with most studies demonstrating feedback is associated with quality improvement^{302–306}. When individuals have ADRs below the recommended threshold, a variety of interventions have been found effective (Table 14).

Split-dose or same day (preparation entirely the morning of the procedure) bowel preparation increased ADR in randomized-controlled studies³⁰⁷. High quality withdrawal technique includes cleaning pools of retained stool, fluid and mucus, exposing hidden mucosa by systematically probing the proximal sides of folds and achieving adequate distention of the entire colon^{150, 151}. A second examination of the right colon, with or without retroflexion, improves detection and is recommended^{308, 309}. Distal attachment devices help expose mucosa and improve ADR in many randomized trials^{310–313}. Other techniques associated with improved ADR include water exchange during colonoscope insertion^{314, 315} and changing patient position during inspection to keep the examined segment non-dependent^{316, 317}. Adequate mucosal exposure and inspection requires time, and a low ADR in combination with short average withdrawal times should be viewed as an indicator of ineffective withdrawal technique, and warrants correction.

Optimized mucosal exposure must be accompanied by training in detection of subtle neoplasia, particularly SSLs. Randomized trials have demonstrated the effectiveness of educational interventions to improve ADR^{318–322}. The Task Force recommends instruction in the Paris classification³²³ to emphasize the importance of flat and depressed lesions, and review of photographs of flat and depressed conventional adenomas and serrated lesions³²⁴.

High-definition endoscopes improve ADR^{325–327}, and are considered mandatory in current colonoscopy practice. Finally, technical adjuncts to improve ADR can be considered. Electronic chromoendoscopy with second-generation narrow-band imaging NBI (Olympus Corp. Center Valley, PA) resulted in a higher ADR than white-light colonoscopy (odds ratio (OR) 1.28, 95% CI, 1.05–1.56) in a meta-analysis of randomized, controlled studies³²⁸, though older versions of NBI and electronic chromoendoscopy did not significantly improve ADR³²⁹. Linked color imaging (Fujifilm Corp, Valhalla, NY) is also associated with detection gains for both adenomas and SSLs^{330, 331}. Artificial intelligence systems for detection of neoplasia have been recently approved in the United States with most randomized controlled studies demonstrating significant improvements in ADR^{332–334} and reduction in the adenoma miss rate³³⁵. Despite the convincing and consistent evidence from randomized trials, assessments of benefit in clinical practice settings have been negative in several instances^{336 337 338}. Generalizability to routine practice settings remains to be demonstrated convincingly.

Successful programmatic colonoscopy quality assurance efforts with demonstrated improvements in patient outcomes have been outlined from the UK National Bowel Cancer Screening Programme^{339–342}, the Netherlands³⁴³, Poland³¹⁸ and Germany³⁴⁴, and the US Veterans Administration³⁴⁵, and Kaiser Permanente Northern California³⁴⁶.

In summary, correction of poor performance begins with measurement of colonoscopy quality to identify specific areas of concern. Quality improvement may depend upon the employment of multifaceted interventions. As a last resort, removal of privileges to perform colonoscopy may be appropriate if satisfactory performance cannot be achieved, as colonoscopy quality is strongly associated with important patient outcomes, such as PCCRC incidence and mortality^{21, 22, 93}. These recommendations hold for colonoscopists in all specialties³⁴⁷.

Glossary

CRC	colorectal cancer
ASGE	American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
ACG	American College of Gastroenterology
CIR	cecal intubation rate
SSLDR	sessile serrated lesion detection rate
MSTF	Multi-Society Task Force
IBD	inflammatory bowel disease
ESGE	European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
BBPS	Boston Bowel Preparation Scale
PCCRC	post colonoscopy CRC
ADR	adenoma detection rate
EOCRC	early onset CRC
APC	Adenomas per colonoscopy
SSL	sessile serrated lesion
HPs	hyperplastic polyps
PSP	proximal serrated polyp
PSPDR	proximal serrated polyp detection rate
FIT	fecal immunochemical test
EMR	endoscopic mucosal resection
DOPyS	Direct Observation of Polypectomy Skills

CSPAT	Cold Snare Polypectomy Assessment Tool
SAEs	serious adverse events
EMR	electronic health medical record
RCA	root cause analysis
IBD	irritable bowel syndrome
MES	Mayo Endoscopic Score
MMES	Modified Mayo Endoscopic Score
UCEIS	Ulcerative Colitis Endoscopic Index of Severity
UCCIS	Ulcerative Colitis Colonoscopic Index of Severity
UC	ulcerative colitis
IOIBD	International Organization for the Study of Inflammatory Bowel Disease
CDEIS	Crohn's Disease Endoscopic Index of Severity
SES-CD	Simple Endoscopic Activity Score in Crohn's Disease
CD	Crohn's disease
BRIDGe	Building Research in Inflammatory Bowel Disease Globally
PSC	primary sclerosing cholangitis
OR	odds ratio

References

1. Rex DK, Boland CR, Dominitz JA, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: Recommendations for physicians and patients from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2017;86:18–33. [PubMed: 28600070]
2. Davidson KW, Barry MJ, Mangione CM, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA* 2021;325:1965–1977. [PubMed: 34003218]
3. Shaikat A, Kahi CJ, Burke CA, et al. ACG clinical guidelines: colorectal cancer screening 2021. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2021;116:458–479. [PubMed: 33657038]
4. Wolf AMD, Fontham ETH, Church TR, et al. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk adults: 2018 guideline update from the American Cancer Society. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2018;68:250–281. [PubMed: 29846947]
5. Kahi CJ, Boland CR, Dominitz JA, et al. Colonoscopy surveillance after colorectal cancer resection: recommendations of the US multi-society task force on colorectal cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;83:489–98 e10. [PubMed: 26802191]
6. Gupta S, Lieberman D, Anderson JC, et al. Recommendations for follow-up after colonoscopy and polypectomy: a consensus update by the US Multi-Society Task Force on colorectal cancer. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2020;115:415–434. [PubMed: 32039982]

7. Laine L, Kaltenbach T, Barkun A, et al. SCENIC international consensus statement on surveillance and management of dysplasia in inflammatory bowel disease. *Gastroenterology* 2015;148:639–651 e28. [PubMed: 25702852]
8. Mandel JS, Church TR, Bond JH, et al. The effect of fecal occult-blood screening on the incidence of colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343:1603–7. [PubMed: 11096167]
9. Schoen RE, Pinsky PF, Weissfeld JL, et al. Colorectal-cancer incidence and mortality with screening flexible sigmoidoscopy. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:2345–57. [PubMed: 22612596]
10. Winawer SJ, Zauber AG, Ho MN, et al. Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic polypectomy. The National Polyp Study Workgroup. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329:1977–81. [PubMed: 8247072]
11. Zauber AG, Winawer SJ, O'Brien MJ, et al. Colonoscopic polypectomy and long-term prevention of colorectal-cancer deaths. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:687–96. [PubMed: 22356322]
12. Kahi CJ, Imperiale TF, Juliar BE, et al. Effect of screening colonoscopy on colorectal cancer incidence and mortality. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009;7:770–5; quiz 711. [PubMed: 19268269]
13. Brenner H, Chang-Claude J, Seiler CM, et al. Protection from colorectal cancer after colonoscopy: a population-based, case-control study. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;154:22–30. [PubMed: 21200035]
14. Doubeni CA, Weinmann S, Adams K, et al. Screening colonoscopy and risk for incident late-stage colorectal cancer diagnosis in average-risk adults: a nested case-control study. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;158:312–20. [PubMed: 23460054]
15. Brenner H, Chang-Claude J, Jansen L, et al. Reduced risk of colorectal cancer up to 10 years after screening, surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology* 2014;146:709–17. [PubMed: 24012982]
16. Baxter NN, Goldwasser MA, Paszat LF, et al. Association of colonoscopy and death from colorectal cancer. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;150:1–8. [PubMed: 19075198]
17. Baxter NN, Warren JL, Barrett MJ, et al. Association between colonoscopy and colorectal cancer mortality in a US cohort according to site of cancer and colonoscopist specialty. *J Clin Oncol* 2012;30:2664–9. [PubMed: 22689809]
18. Nishihara R, Wu K, Lochhead P, et al. Long-term colorectal-cancer incidence and mortality after lower endoscopy. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1095–105. [PubMed: 24047059]
19. Edwards BK, Ward E, Kohler BA, et al. Annual report to the nation on the status of cancer, 1975–2006, featuring colorectal cancer trends and impact of interventions (risk factors, screening, and treatment) to reduce future rates. *Cancer* 2010;116:544–73. [PubMed: 19998273]
20. Siegel R, Desantis C, Jemal A. Colorectal cancer statistics, 2014. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2014;64:104–17. [PubMed: 24639052]
21. Kaminski MF, Regula J, Kraszewska E, et al. Quality indicators for colonoscopy and the risk of interval cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1795–803. [PubMed: 20463339]
22. Corley DA, Jensen CD, Marks AR, et al. Adenoma detection rate and risk of colorectal cancer and death. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:1298–306. [PubMed: 24693890]
23. Ladabaum U, Shepard J, Mannalithara A. Adenoma and serrated lesion detection by colonoscopy indication: the ADR-ESS (ADR Extended to all Screening/Surveillance) Score. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2021;19:1873–1882. [PubMed: 33895358]
24. Rex DK. Colonoscopy: the current king of the hill in the USA. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015;60:639–46. [PubMed: 25511920]
25. Bretthauer M, Loberg M, Wieszczy P, et al. Effect of colonoscopy screening on risks of colorectal cancer and related death. *N Engl J Med* 2022;387:1547–1556. [PubMed: 36214590]
26. Barclay RL, Vicari JJ, Doughty AS, et al. Colonoscopic withdrawal times and adenoma detection during screening colonoscopy. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355:2533–41. [PubMed: 17167136]
27. Schoenfeld P, Cash B, Flood A, et al. Colonoscopic screening of average-risk women for colorectal neoplasia. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:2061–8. [PubMed: 15901859]
28. Chen SC, Rex DK. Endoscopist can be more powerful than age and male gender in predicting adenoma detection at colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2007;102:856–61. [PubMed: 17222317]
29. Rex DK, Bond JH, Winawer S, et al. Quality in the technical performance of colonoscopy and the continuous quality improvement process for colonoscopy: recommendations of the U.S.

- Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002;97:1296–308. [PubMed: 12094842]
30. Rex DK, Petrini JL, Baron TH, et al. Quality indicators for colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2006;63:S16–28. [PubMed: 16564908]
 31. Rex DK, Schoenfeld PS, Cohen J, et al. Quality indicators for colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;81:31–53. [PubMed: 25480100]
 32. Gupta S, Lieberman D, Anderson JC, et al. Recommendations for Follow-Up After Colonoscopy and Polypectomy: A Consensus Update by the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;91:463–485 e5. [PubMed: 32044106]
 33. Duloy AM, Kaltenbach TR, Keswani RN. Assessing colon polypectomy competency and its association with established quality metrics. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;87:635–644. [PubMed: 28882577]
 34. Elmunzer J, Anderson M, Mishra G, et al. Quality indicators for GI endoscopic procedures: Quality indicators common to all GI endoscopic procedures not yet submitted 2023.
 35. Taskforce AEUQI, Day LW, Cohen J, et al. Quality indicators for gastrointestinal endoscopy units. *VideoGIE* 2017;2:119–140. [PubMed: 29905282]
 36. Baxter NN, Sutradhar R, Forbes SS, et al. Analysis of administrative data finds endoscopist quality measures associated with postcolonoscopy colorectal cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2011;140:65–72. [PubMed: 20854818]
 37. Vemulapalli KC, Wilder SW, Kahi CJ, et al. Long-Term Assessment of the Cecal Intubation Rates in High-Performing Colonoscopists: Time for Review. *Clin Transl Gastroenterol* 2020;11:e00153. [PubMed: 32352718]
 38. Siau K, Hodson J, Ravindran S, et al. Variability in cecal intubation rate by calculation method: a call for standardization of key performance indicators in endoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;89:1026–1036 e2. [PubMed: 30659830]
 39. Early DS, Ben-Menachem T, Decker GA, et al. Appropriate use of GI endoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2012;75:1127–31. [PubMed: 22624807]
 40. Balaguer F, Llach J, Castells A, et al. The European panel on the appropriateness of gastrointestinal endoscopy guidelines colonoscopy in an open-access endoscopy unit: a prospective study. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2005;21:609–13. [PubMed: 15740545]
 41. Vader JP, Pache I, Froehlich F, et al. Overuse and underuse of colonoscopy in a European primary care setting. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2000;52:593–99. [PubMed: 11060181]
 42. de Bosset V, Froehlich F, Rey JP, et al. Do explicit appropriateness criteria enhance the diagnostic yield of colonoscopy? *Endoscopy* 2002;34:360–8. [PubMed: 11972266]
 43. Terraz O, Wietlisbach V, Jeannot JG, et al. The EPAGE internet guideline as a decision support tool for determining the appropriateness of colonoscopy. *Digestion* 2005;71:72–7. [PubMed: 15775674]
 44. Morini S, Hassan C, Meucci G, et al. Diagnostic yield of open access colonoscopy according to appropriateness. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2001;54:175–9. [PubMed: 11474386]
 45. Bersani G, Rossi A, Ricci G, et al. Do ASGE guidelines for the appropriate use of colonoscopy enhance the probability of finding relevant pathologies in an open access service? *Dig Liver Dis* 2005;37:609–14. [PubMed: 15996629]
 46. Baron TH, Kimery BD, Sorbi D, et al. Strategies to address increased demand for colonoscopy: Guidelines in an open endoscopy practice. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2004;2:178–82. [PubMed: 15017624]
 47. Johnson DA, Barkun AN, Cohen LB, et al. Optimizing adequacy of bowel cleansing for colonoscopy: recommendations from the U.S. multi-society task force on colorectal cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2014;80:543–562. [PubMed: 25220509]
 48. Hassan C, Bretthauer M, Kaminski MF, et al. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guideline. *Endoscopy* 2013;45:142–50. [PubMed: 23335011]
 49. Hassan C, East J, Radaelli F, et al. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline - Update 2019. *Endoscopy* 2019;51:775–794. [PubMed: 31295746]

50. Rex DK, Imperiale TF, Latinovich DR, et al. Impact of bowel preparation on efficiency and cost of colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002;97:1696–700. [PubMed: 12135020]
51. Kluge MA, Williams JL, Wu CK, et al. Inadequate Boston Bowel Preparation Scale scores predict the risk of missed neoplasia on the next colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;87:744–751. [PubMed: 28648575]
52. Clark BT, Protiva P, Nagar A, et al. Quantification of adequate bowel preparation for screening or surveillance colonoscopy in men. *Gastroenterology* 2016;150:396–405; quiz e14–5. [PubMed: 26439436]
53. Kahi CJ, Boland CR, Dominitz JA, et al. Colonoscopy surveillance after colorectal cancer resection: recommendations of the US Multi-Society Task Force on colorectal cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2016;150:758–768 e11. [PubMed: 26892199]
54. Rex DK. Achieving cecal intubation in the difficult colon (with videos). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;95:568–572. [PubMed: 34863805]
55. Liu TT, Meng YT, Xiong F, et al. Impact of an abdominal compression bandage on the completion of colonoscopy for obese adults: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;2022:6010367. [PubMed: 36111243]
56. Li Y, Xing S, Chen R, et al. The effect of oral polyethylene glycol combined with simethicone for colonoscopy on cecal intubation rate, tolerability and acceptability : a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Gastroenterol Belg* 2019;82:407–415. [PubMed: 31566329]
57. Committee AT, Trindade AJ, Lichtenstein DR, et al. Devices and methods to improve colonoscopy completion (with videos). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;87:625–634. [PubMed: 29454445]
58. Rex DK, Repici A, Gross SA, et al. High-definition colonoscopy versus Endocuff versus EndoRings versus full-spectrum endoscopy for adenoma detection at colonoscopy: a multicenter randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;88:335–344 e2. [PubMed: 29530353]
59. Rex DK, Lehman GA, Ulbright TM, et al. Colonic neoplasia in asymptomatic persons with negative fecal occult blood tests: influence of age, gender, and family history. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1993;88:825–31. [PubMed: 8503374]
60. Lieberman DA, Weiss DG, Bond JH, et al. Use of colonoscopy to screen asymptomatic adults for colorectal cancer. Veterans Affairs Cooperative Study Group 380. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343:162–8. [PubMed: 10900274]
61. Imperiale TF, Wagner DR, Lin CY, et al. Risk of advanced proximal neoplasms in asymptomatic adults according to the distal colorectal findings. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343:169–74. [PubMed: 10900275]
62. Schoenfeld P, Cash B, Flood A, et al. Colonoscopic screening of average-risk women for colorectal neoplasia. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:2061–8. [PubMed: 15901859]
63. Patel SG, May FP, Anderson JC, et al. Updates on age to start and stop colorectal cancer screening: recommendations from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;95:1–15. [PubMed: 34794803]
64. Karsenti D, Tharsis G, Burtin P, et al. Adenoma and advanced neoplasia detection rates increase from 45 years of age. *World J Gastroenterol* 2019;25:447–456. [PubMed: 30700941]
65. Imperiale TF, Kisiel JB, Itzkowitz SH, et al. Specificity of the multi-target stool DNA test for colorectal cancer screening in average-risk 45–49 year-olds: a cross-sectional study. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)* 2021;14:489–496. [PubMed: 33436397]
66. Butterly LF, Siegel RL, Fedewa S, et al. Colonoscopy outcomes in average-risk screening equivalent young adults: data from the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2021;116:171–179. [PubMed: 32833734]
67. Shaukat A, Rex DK, Shyne M, et al. Adenoma detection rates for 45- to 49-Year-old screening population. *Gastroenterology* 2022;162:957–959 e1. [PubMed: 34537208]
68. Ladabaum U, Shepard J, Mannalithara A. Adenoma and sessile serrated lesion detection rates at screening colonoscopy for ages 45–49 years vs older ages since the introduction of new colorectal cancer screening guidelines. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;20:2895–2904 e4. [PubMed: 35580769]

69. Liang PS, Williams JL, Dominitz JA, et al. Age-stratified prevalence and predictors of neoplasia among U.S. adults undergoing screening colonoscopy in a national endoscopy registry. *Gastroenterology* 2022;163:742–753 e4. [PubMed: 35643172]
70. Bilal M, Holub J, Greenwald D, et al. Adenoma detection rates in 45–49-Year-old persons undergoing screening colonoscopy: analysis from the GIQuIC registry. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2022;117:806–808. [PubMed: 35169107]
71. Trivedi PD, Mohapatra A, Morris MK, et al. Prevalence and predictors of young-onset colorectal neoplasia: insights from a nationally representative colonoscopy registry. *Gastroenterology* 2022;162:1136–1146 e5. [PubMed: 35007513]
72. Shaukat A, Holub J, Pike IM, et al. Benchmarking adenoma detection rates for colonoscopy: results from a US-based registry. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2021;116:1946–1949. [PubMed: 34158463]
73. Ross WA, Thirumurthi S, Lynch PM, et al. Detection rates of premalignant polyps during screening colonoscopy: time to revise quality standards? *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;81:567–74. [PubMed: 25583558]
74. Yang PF, Wong SW. Adenoma detection rate in colonoscopy: is indication a predictor? *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2016;26:156–61. [PubMed: 26813239]
75. Ponugoti PL, Rex DK. Yield of a second screening colonoscopy 10 years after an initial negative examination in average-risk individuals. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;10.1016/j.gie.2016.05.024.
76. Rex DK, Ponugoti PL, Johnson CS, et al. Neoplasia at 10-year follow-up screening colonoscopy in a private U.S. practice: comparison of yield to first-time examinations. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;87:254–259. [PubMed: 28478026]
77. Anderson JC, Butterly LF, Goodrich M, et al. Differences in detection rates of adenomas and serrated polyps in screening versus surveillance colonoscopies, based on the new hampshire colonoscopy registry. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013;11:1308–12. [PubMed: 23660415]
78. Marcondes FO, Dean KM, Schoen RE, et al. The impact of exclusion criteria on a physician's adenoma detection rate. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;82:668–75. [PubMed: 26385275]
79. Boroff ES, Disbrow M, Crowell MD, et al. Adenoma and polyp detection rates in colonoscopy according to indication. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2017;2017:7207595. [PubMed: 29445393]
80. Rex DK, Ponugoti PL. Calculating the adenoma detection rate in screening colonoscopies only: Is it necessary? Can it be gamed? *Endoscopy* 2017;49:1069–1074. [PubMed: 28753699]
81. Brand EC, Crook JE, Thomas CS, et al. Development and validation of a prediction model for adenoma detection during screening and surveillance colonoscopy with comparison to actual adenoma detection rates. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0185560. [PubMed: 28957445]
82. Kaltenbach T, Gawron A, Meyer CS, et al. Adenoma detection rate (ADR) irrespective of indication is comparable to screening ADR: implications for quality monitoring. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2021;19:1883–1889 e1. [PubMed: 33618027]
83. Desai M, Rex DK, Bohm ME, et al. Impact of withdrawal time on adenoma detection rate: results from a prospective multicenter trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2023;97:537–543 e2. [PubMed: 36228700]
84. Kajzrlíkova IM, Vitek P, Chalupa J, et al. Correlation between ADR of screening and all colonoscopies. *Biomedical Papers-Olomouc* 2021;165:386–389.
85. Kaltenbach T, Gawron A, Meyer C, et al. Adenoma detection rates similar in screening and all indication colonoscopies for majority of endoscopists. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2023;AB129–AB130.
86. Wisse PHA, Erler NS, de Boer SY, et al. Adenoma Detection Rate and Risk for Interval Postcolonoscopy Colorectal Cancer in Fecal Immunochemical Test-Based Screening : A Population-Based Cohort Study. *Ann Intern Med* 2022;175:1366–1373. [PubMed: 36162114]
87. Cubiella J, Digby J, Rodriguez-Alonso L, et al. The fecal hemoglobin concentration, age and sex test score: Development and external validation of a simple prediction tool for colorectal cancer detection in symptomatic patients. *Int J Cancer* 2017;140:2201–2211. [PubMed: 28187494]
88. Anderson JC, Robinson CM, Hisey W, et al. Colonoscopy findings in FIT+ and mt-sDNA+ patients versus in colonoscopy-only patients: New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry data. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)* 2022;15:455–464. [PubMed: 35378546]

89. Hilsden RJ, Bridges R, Dube C, et al. Defining benchmarks for adenoma detection rate and adenomas per colonoscopy in patients undergoing colonoscopy due to a positive fecal immunochemical test. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2016;111:1743–1749. [PubMed: 27725649]
90. Kligman E, Li W, Eckert GJ, et al. Adenoma detection rate in asymptomatic patients with positive fecal immunochemical tests. *Dig Dis Sci* 2018;63:1167–1172. [PubMed: 29468377]
91. Robertson DJ, Lee JK, Boland CR, et al. Recommendations on fecal immunochemical testing to screen for colorectal neoplasia: a consensus statement by the US Multi-Society Task Force on colorectal cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2017;152:1217–1237.e3. [PubMed: 27769517]
92. Corley DA, Jensen CD, Chubak J, et al. Evaluating different approaches for calculating adenoma detection rate: Is screening colonoscopy the gold standard? *Gastroenterology* 2023;10.1053/j.gastro.2023.05.025.
93. Schottinger JE, Jensen CD, Ghai NR, et al. Association of physician adenoma detection rates with postcolonoscopy colorectal cancer. *JAMA* 2022;327:2114–2122. [PubMed: 35670788]
94. Brenner H, Altenhofen L, Kretschmann J, et al. Trends in adenoma detection rates during the first 10 years of the german screening colonoscopy program. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149:356–66 e1. [PubMed: 25911510]
95. Hilsden RJ, Rose SM, Dube C, et al. Defining and applying locally relevant benchmarks for the adenoma detection rate. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2019;114:1315–1321. [PubMed: 30848731]
96. Rex DK, Sullivan AW, Perkins AJ, et al. Colorectal polyp prevalence and aspirational detection targets determined using high definition colonoscopy and a high level detector in 2017. *Dig Liver Dis* 2020;52:72–78. [PubMed: 31543411]
97. Hassan C, Piovani D, Spadaccini M, et al. Variability in adenoma detection rate in control groups of randomized colonoscopy trials. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;10.1016/j.gie.2022.10.009.
98. Do A, Weinberg J, Kakkar A, et al. Reliability of adenoma detection rate is based on procedural volume. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2013;77:376–80. [PubMed: 23211748]
99. Selby K, Jensen CD, Levin TR, et al. Program components and results from an organized colorectal cancer screening program using annual fecal immunochemical testing. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;20:145–152. [PubMed: 33010408]
100. Mohan BP, Khan SR, Daugherty E, et al. Pooled rates of adenoma detection by colonoscopy in asymptomatic average-risk individuals with positive fecal immunochemical test: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;96:208–222 e14. [PubMed: 35413330]
101. Johnson DH, Kisiel JB, Burger KN, et al. Multitarget stool DNA test: clinical performance and impact on yield and quality of colonoscopy for colorectal cancer screening. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2017;85:657–665 e1. [PubMed: 27884518]
102. Anderson JC, Robinson CM, Hisey WM, et al. Colorectal neoplasia detection in individuals with positive multitarget stool DNA tests: data from the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2022;56:419–425. [PubMed: 33973962]
103. Eckmann JD, Ebner DW, Bering J, et al. Multitarget stool DNA screening in clinical practice: high positive predictive value for colorectal neoplasia regardless of exposure to previous colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2020;115:608–615. [PubMed: 32068535]
104. Vakil N, Ciezki K, Huq N, et al. Multitarget stool DNA testing for the prevention of colon cancer: outcomes in a large integrated healthcare system. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;92:334–341. [PubMed: 31904379]
105. Rex DK, Alikhan M, Cummings O, et al. Accuracy of pathologic interpretation of colorectal polyps by general pathologists in community practice. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1999;50:468–74. [PubMed: 10502165]
106. Rex DK. Detection Measures for Colonoscopy: Considerations On the Adenoma Detection Rate, Recommended Detection Thresholds, Withdrawal Times, and Potential Updates to Measures. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2020;54:130–135. [PubMed: 31851104]
107. Wieszczy P, Bugajski M, Januszewicz W, et al. Comparison of quality measures for detection of neoplasia at screening colonoscopy. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2023;21:200–209 e6. [PubMed: 35341951]

108. Kahi CJ, Vemulapalli KC, Johnson CS, et al. Improving measurement of the adenoma detection rate and adenoma per colonoscopy quality metric: the Indiana University experience. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2014;79:448–54. [PubMed: 24246797]
109. Gessl I, Waldmann E, Penz D, et al. Evaluation of adenomas per colonoscopy and adenomas per positive participant as new quality parameters in screening colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;89:496–502. [PubMed: 30138613]
110. Wang S, Kim AS, Church TR, et al. Adenomas per colonoscopy and adenoma per positive participant as quality indicators for screening colonoscopy. *Endosc Int Open* 2020;8:E1560–E1565. [PubMed: 33140011]
111. Park SK, Kim HY, Lee CK, et al. Comparison of adenoma detection rate and adenoma per colonoscopy as a quality indicator of colonoscopy. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2016;51:886–90. [PubMed: 27001284]
112. Wang HS, Pisegna J, Modi R, et al. Adenoma detection rate is necessary but insufficient for distinguishing high versus low endoscopist performance. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2013;77:71–8. [PubMed: 23261096]
113. Han JH, Kim HG, Ahn EM, et al. Correlation between surrogate quality indicators for adenoma detection rate and adenoma miss rate in qualified colonoscopy, CORE study: KASID multicenter study. *Gut Liver* 2022;16:716–725. [PubMed: 34933279]
114. Aziz M, Haghbin H, Sayeh W, et al. Comparison of artificial intelligence with other interventions to improve adenoma detection rate for colonoscopy: a network meta-analysis. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2022;10.1097/MCG.0000000000001813.
115. Rex DK, Hardacker K, MacPhail M, et al. Determining the adenoma detection rate and adenomas per colonoscopy by photography alone: proof-of-concept study. *Endoscopy* 2015;47:245–50. [PubMed: 25590185]
116. Peng M, Rex DK. Surveying ADR Knowledge and Practices Among US Gastroenterologists. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2020;54:158–163. [PubMed: 30807401]
117. Khalid O, Radaideh S, Cummings OW, et al. Reinterpretation of histology of proximal colon polyps called hyperplastic in 2001. *World J Gastroenterol* 2009;15:3767–70. [PubMed: 19673017]
118. Payne SR, Church TR, Wandell M, et al. Endoscopic detection of proximal serrated lesions and pathologic identification of sessile serrated adenomas/polyps vary on the basis of center. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014;12:1119–26. [PubMed: 24333512]
119. Vennelaganti S, Cuatrecasas M, Vennalaganti P, et al. Moderate inter-observer agreement among pathologists in differentiation of sessile serrated from hyperplastic polyps. *Gastroenterology* 2020;10.1053/j.gastro.2020.09.015.
120. Gourevitch RA, Rose S, Crockett SD, et al. Variation in pathologist classification of colorectal adenomas and serrated polyps. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2018;113:431–439. [PubMed: 29380819]
121. Rex DK, Ahnen DJ, Baron JA, et al. Serrated lesions of the colorectum: review and recommendations from an expert panel. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2012;107:1315–29; quiz 1314, 1330. [PubMed: 22710576]
122. Anderson JC, Hisey W, Mackenzie TA, et al. Clinically significant serrated polyp detection rates and risk for post colonoscopy colorectal cancer: data from the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;10.1016/j.gie.2022.03.001.
123. van Toledo D, JEG II, Bossuyt PMM, et al. Serrated polyp detection and risk of interval post-colonoscopy colorectal cancer: a population-based study. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;10.1016/S2468-1253(22)00090-5.
124. Zessner-Spitzenberg J, Waldmann E, Jiricka L, et al. Comparison of adenoma detection rate and proximal serrated polyp detection rate and their effect on post-colonoscopy colorectal cancer mortality in screening patients. *Endoscopy* 2022;10.1055/a-1974-9979.
125. Shaikat A, Holub J, Greenwald D, et al. Variation over time and factors associated With detection rates of sessile serrated lesion across the United States: results from a national sample using the GIQuIC Registry. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2021;116:95–99. [PubMed: 32833735]

126. JE IJ, Madani A, Overbeek LI, et al. Implementation of an e-learning module improves consistency in the histopathological diagnosis of sessile serrated lesions within a nationwide population screening programme. *Histopathology* 2017;70:929–937. [PubMed: 28000308]
127. Desai M, Anderson JC, Kaminski M, et al. Sessile serrated lesion detection rates during average risk screening colonoscopy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the published literature. *Endosc Int Open* 2021;9:E610–E620. [PubMed: 33869735]
128. Meester RGS, van Herk M, Lansdorp-Vogelaar I, et al. Prevalence and clinical features of sessile serrated polyps: a systematic review. *Gastroenterology* 2020;159:105–118 e25. [PubMed: 32199884]
129. Anderson JC, Rex DK, Mackenzie TA, et al. Higher Serrated Polyp Detection Rates are Associated with Lower Risk for Post Colonoscopy Colorectal Cancer: Data From the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry. *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 2023;IN PRESS.
130. Chang LC, Shun CT, Hsu WF, et al. Fecal immunochemical test detects sessile serrated adenomas and polyps with a low level of sensitivity. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2017;15:872–879 e1. [PubMed: 27498176]
131. Anderson JC, Hisey WM, Robinson CM, et al. Serrated polyp yield at colonoscopy in patients with positive FIT, positive mt-sDNA, and colonoscopy only: Data from the New Hampshire colonoscopy registry. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2023;32:226–232. [PubMed: 36409472]
132. Rex DK, Cutler CS, Lemmel GT, et al. Colonoscopic miss rates of adenomas determined by back-to-back colonoscopies. *Gastroenterology* 1997;112:24–8. [PubMed: 8978338]
133. Barclay RL, Vicari JJ, Greenlaw RL. Effect of a time-dependent colonoscopic withdrawal protocol on adenoma detection during screening colonoscopy. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2008;6:1091–8. [PubMed: 18639495]
134. Overholt BF, Brooks-Belli L, Grace M, et al. Withdrawal times and associated factors in colonoscopy: a quality assurance multicenter assessment. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2010;44:e80–6. [PubMed: 19881361]
135. Benson ME, Reichelderfer M, Said A, et al. Variation in colonoscopic technique and adenoma detection rates at an academic gastroenterology unit. *Dig Dis Sci* 2010;55:166–71. [PubMed: 19156519]
136. Liang J, Kalady MF, Appau K, et al. Serrated polyp detection rate during screening colonoscopy. *Colorectal Dis* 2012;14:1323–7. [PubMed: 22390284]
137. Jover R, Zapater P, Polania E, et al. Modifiable endoscopic factors that influence the adenoma detection rate in colorectal cancer screening colonoscopies. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2013;77:381–389. [PubMed: 23218945]
138. Lee TJ, Blanks RG, Rees CJ, et al. Longer mean colonoscopy withdrawal time is associated with increased adenoma detection: evidence from the Bowel Cancer Screening Programme in England. *Endoscopy* 2013;45:20–6. [PubMed: 23254403]
139. Butterly L, Robinson CM, Anderson JC, et al. Serrated and adenomatous polyp detection increases with longer withdrawal time: results from the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2014;109:417–26. [PubMed: 24394752]
140. Kashiwagi K, Inoue N, Yoshida T, et al. Polyp detection rate in transverse and sigmoid colon significantly increases with longer withdrawal time during screening colonoscopy. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0174155. [PubMed: 28328936]
141. Coghlan E, LaFerrere L, Zenon E, et al. Timed screening colonoscopy: a randomized trial of two colonoscopic withdrawal techniques. *Surg Endosc* 2020;34:1200–1205. [PubMed: 31144121]
142. Yun GY, Eun HS, Kim JS, et al. Colonoscopic withdrawal time and adenoma detection in the right colon. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2018;97:e12113. [PubMed: 30170441]
143. Patel VD, Thompson WK, Lapin BR, et al. Screening colonoscopy withdrawal time threshold for adequate proximal serrated polyp detection rate. *Dig Dis Sci* 2018;63:3084–3090. [PubMed: 29974376]
144. Cavicchi M, Tharsis G, Burtin P, et al. Difference in physician- and patient-dependent factors contributing to adenoma detection rate and serrated polyp detection rate. *Dig Dis Sci* 2019;64:3579–3588. [PubMed: 31471862]

145. Jung Y, Joo YE, Kim HG, et al. Relationship between the endoscopic withdrawal time and adenoma/polyp detection rate in individual colonic segments: a KASID multicenter study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;89:523–530. [PubMed: 30267654]
146. Desai M, Rex DK, Bohm ME, et al. Impact of withdrawal time on adenoma detection rate: results from a prospective, multi-center trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;10.1016/j.gie.2022.09.031.
147. Zhao S, Yang X, Wang S, et al. Impact of 9-Minute Withdrawal Time on the Adenoma Detection Rate: A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;20:e168–e181. [PubMed: 33220526]
148. Zhao S, Song Y, Wang S, et al. Reduced adenoma miss rate with 9-minute vs. 6-minute withdrawal times for screening colonoscopy: a multicenter randomized tandem trial: nine-minute WT reduces the AMR of screening colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2022;10.14309/ajg.0000000000002055.
149. Shaikat A, Rector TS, Church TR, et al. Longer withdrawal time is associated with a reduced incidence of interval cancer after screening colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149:952–7. [PubMed: 26164494]
150. Rex DK. Colonoscopic withdrawal technique is associated with adenoma miss rates. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2000;51:33–6. [PubMed: 10625792]
151. Rex DK, Hewett DG, Raghavendra M, et al. The impact of videorecording on the quality of colonoscopy performance: a pilot study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2010;105:2312–7. [PubMed: 21048675]
152. Rex DK, Slaven JE, Garcia J, et al. Endocuff Vision reduces inspection time without decreasing lesion detection: a clinical randomized trial. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2020;18:158–162 e1. [PubMed: 30659990]
153. Kaltenbach T, Anderson JC, Burke CA, et al. Endoscopic removal of colorectal lesions—recommendations by the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;91:486–519. [PubMed: 32067745]
154. Ferlitsch M, Moss A, Hassan C, et al. Colorectal polypectomy and endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR): European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Clinical Guideline. *Endoscopy* 2017;49:270–297. [PubMed: 28212588]
155. Plumb AA, Nickerson C, Wooldrage K, et al. Terminal digit preference biases polyp size measurements at endoscopy, computed tomographic colonography, and histopathology. *Endoscopy* 2016;48:899–908. [PubMed: 27441685]
156. The Paris endoscopic classification of superficial neoplastic lesions: esophagus, stomach, and colon: November 30 to December 1, 2002. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2003;58:S3–43. [PubMed: 14652541]
157. Shaikat A, Kaltenbach T, Dominitz JA, et al. Endoscopic recognition and management strategies for malignant colorectal polyps: recommendations of the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;92:997–1015 e1. [PubMed: 33160507]
158. van Doorn SC, Hazewinkel Y, East JE, et al. Polyp morphology: an interobserver evaluation for the Paris classification among international experts. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015;110:180–7. [PubMed: 25331346]
159. Suresh S, Zhang J, Ahmed A, et al. Risk factors associated with adenoma recurrence following cold snare endoscopic mucosal resection of polyps ≥ 20 mm: a retrospective chart review. *Endosc Int Open* 2021;9:E867–E873. [PubMed: 34079869]
160. Sreepati G, Vemulapalli KC, Rex DK. Clip artifact after closure of large colorectal EMR sites: incidence and recognition. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;82:344–9. [PubMed: 25843616]
161. Rex DK. Diagnosis and management of clip artifact on endoscopic mucosal resection scars. *Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2021;17:464–468. [PubMed: 35462732]
162. Ponugoti PL, Cummings OW, Rex DK. Risk of cancer in small and diminutive colorectal polyps. *Dig Liver Dis* 2017;49:34–37. [PubMed: 27443490]
163. Yamashina T, Fukuhara M, Maruo T, et al. Cold snare polypectomy reduced delayed postpolypectomy bleeding compared with conventional hot polypectomy: a propensity score-matching analysis. *Endosc Int Open* 2017;05:E587–E594.

164. Paspatis GA, Tribonias G, Konstantinidis K, et al. A prospective randomized comparison of cold vs hot snare polypectomy in the occurrence of postpolypectomy bleeding in small colonic polyps. *Colorectal Dis* 2011;13:e345–8. [PubMed: 21689363]
165. Trivedi M, Klapheke R, Youssef F, et al. Comparison of cold snare and hot snare polypectomy for the resection of sporadic nonampullary duodenal adenomas. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;96:657–664 e2. [PubMed: 35618029]
166. Takamaru H, Saito Y, Hammoud GM, et al. Comparison of postpolypectomy bleeding events between cold snare polypectomy and hot snare polypectomy for small colorectal lesions: a large-scale propensity score-matched analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2021;10.1016/j.gie.2021.12.017.
167. Toyosawa J, Yamasaki Y, Fujimoto T, et al. Resection depth for small colorectal polyps comparing cold snare polypectomy, hot snare polypectomy and underwater endoscopic mucosal resection. *Endosc Int Open* 2022; 10(05): E602–E608 2022;10.1055/a-1785-8616. [PubMed: 35571476]
168. Suzuki S, Gotoda T, Kusano C, et al. Width and depth of resection for small colorectal polyps: hot versus cold snare polypectomy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;87:1095–1103. [PubMed: 29122600]
169. Pedersen IB, Rawa-Golebiewska A, Calderwood AH, et al. Complete polyp resection with cold snare versus hot snare polypectomy for polyps of 4–9 mm: a randomized controlled trial. *Endoscopy* 2022;54:961–969. [PubMed: 35008112]
170. de Benito Sanz M, Hernandez L, Garcia Martinez MI, et al. Efficacy and safety of cold versus hot snare polypectomy for small (5–9 mm) colorectal polyps: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Endoscopy* 2022;54:35–44. [PubMed: 33264811]
171. McCarty TR, Aihara H. Cold snare polypectomy should be preferred strategy for small, nonpedunculated colon polyps: results from a recent multicenter noninferiority randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;96:339–340. [PubMed: 35843672]
172. Varytimiadis L, Viazis N, Gkolfakis P, et al. Cold snare polypectomy vs. hot snare polypectomy vs. argon plasma coagulation for small (5–9mm) left-sided colorectal polyps: a prospective randomized trial. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2021;33:e909–e915. [PubMed: 35048657]
173. Oh CK, Choi HS, Cho YS. Comparison of cold snare polypectomy and endoscopic mucosal resection for 3–10-mm colorectal polyps in end-stage renal disease patients. *Saudi J Gastroenterol* 2022;28:67–73. [PubMed: 34755710]
174. Kawamura T, Takeuchi Y, Asai S, et al. A comparison of the resection rate for cold and hot snare polypectomy for 4–9 mm colorectal polyps: a multicentre randomised controlled trial (CRESCENT study). *Gut* 2018;67:1950–1957. [PubMed: 28970290]
175. Rex DK, Anderson JC, Pohl H, et al. Cold versus hot snare resection with or without submucosal injection of 6- to 15-mm colorectal polyps: a randomized controlled trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;96:330–338. [PubMed: 35288147]
176. Shinozaki S, Kobayashi Y, Hayashi Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of cold versus hot snare polypectomy for resecting small colorectal polyps: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dig Endosc* 2018;30:592–599. [PubMed: 29675857]
177. Sidhu M, Forbes N, Tate DJ, et al. A randomized controlled trial of cold snare polypectomy technique: technique matters more than snare wire diameter. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2022;117:100. [PubMed: 34817440]
178. Wei MT, Louie CY, Chen Y, et al. Randomized controlled trial investigating cold snare and forceps polypectomy among small POLYPs in rates of complete resection: The TINYPOLYP Trial. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2022;117:1305–1310. [PubMed: 35467557]
179. Perrod G, Perez-Cuadrado-Robles E, Coron E, et al. Comparison of cold biopsy forceps vs cold snare for diminutive colorectal polyp removal: A multicenter non-inferiority randomized controlled trial. *Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol* 2022;46:101867. [PubMed: 35038578]
180. Desai S, Gupta S, Copur-Dahi N, et al. A prospective randomized study comparing jumbo biopsy forceps to cold snare for the resection of diminutive colorectal polyps. *Surg Endosc* 2020;34:1206–1213. [PubMed: 31183796]
181. Kim JS, Lee BI, Choi H, et al. Cold snare polypectomy versus cold forceps polypectomy for diminutive and small colorectal polyps: a randomized controlled trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;81:741–7. [PubMed: 25708763]

182. Park SK, Ko BM, Han JP, et al. A prospective randomized comparative study of cold forceps polypectomy by using narrow-band imaging endoscopy versus cold snare polypectomy in patients with diminutive colorectal polyps. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;83:527–32 e1. [PubMed: 26358331]
183. Raad D, Tripathi P, Cooper G, et al. Role of the cold biopsy technique in diminutive and small colonic polyp removal: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;83:508–15. [PubMed: 26545637]
184. Jung YS, Park CH, Nam E, et al. Comparative efficacy of cold polypectomy techniques for diminutive colorectal polyps: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc* 2018;32:1149–1159. [PubMed: 28812188]
185. Kudo T, Horiuchi A, Horiuchi I, et al. Pedunculated colorectal polyps with heads $\leq$ 1 cm in diameter can be resected using cold snare polypectomy. *Acta Gastroenterol Belg* 2021;84:411–415. [PubMed: 34599564]
186. Arimoto J, Chiba H, Ashikari K, et al. Management of less than 10-mm-sized pedunculated (Ip) polyps with thin stalk: hot snare polypectomy versus cold snare polypectomy. *Dig Dis Sci* 2021;66:2353–2361. [PubMed: 32623550]
187. Pohl H, de Latour R, Reuben A, et al. GI multisociety strategic plan on environmental sustainability. *Gastroenterology* 2022;163:1695–1701 e2. [PubMed: 36270827]
188. Pohl H, Robertson DJ. Colorectal cancers detected after colonoscopy frequently result from missed lesions. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2010;8:858–64. [PubMed: 20655393]
189. Beaton D, Beintaris I, Rutter MD. Utilization and reproducibility of World Endoscopy Organization post-colonoscopy colorectal cancer algorithms: retrospective analysis. *Endoscopy* 2022;54:270–277. [PubMed: 33682892]
190. Anderson R, Burr NE, Valori R. Causes of post-colonoscopy colorectal cancers based on world endoscopy organization system of analysis. *Gastroenterology* 2020;10.1053/j.gastro.2019.12.031.
191. Pohl H, Srivastava A, Bensen SP, et al. Incomplete polyp resection during colonoscopy-results of the complete adenoma resection (CARE) study. *Gastroenterology* 2013;144:74–80 e1. [PubMed: 23022496]
192. Gupta S, Anderson J, Bhandari P, et al. Development and validation of a novel method for assessing competency in polypectomy: direct observation of polypectomy skills. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2011;73:1232–9 e2. [PubMed: 21628015]
193. Patel SG, Duloy A, Kaltenbach T, et al. Development and validation of a video-based cold snare polypectomy assessment tool (with videos). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;89:1222–1230 e2. [PubMed: 30844372]
194. Jayanna M, Burgess NG, Singh R, et al. Cost analysis of endoscopic mucosal resection vs surgery for large laterally spreading colorectal lesions. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2016;14:271–8 e1-2. [PubMed: 26364679]
195. Keswani RN, Law R, Ciolino JD, et al. Adverse events after surgery for nonmalignant colon polyps are common and associated with increased length of stay and costs. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;84:296–303 e1. [PubMed: 26828760]
196. Saade R, Tsang T, Kmeid M, et al. Overutilization of surgical resection for benign colorectal polyps: analysis from a tertiary care center. *Endosc Int Open* 2021;9:E706–E712. [PubMed: 33937512]
197. Stockley C, Evans B, Loughheed M, et al. Management of the colonic polyps referred for surgery: an opportunity for improvement. *Surg Endosc* 2022;36:5392–5397. [PubMed: 34750703]
198. Wickham CJ, Wang J, Mirza KL, et al. “Unresectable” polyp management utilizing advanced endoscopic techniques results in high rate of colon preservation. *Surg Endosc* 2022;36:2121–2128. [PubMed: 33890178]
199. Fraiman J, Brownlee S, Stoto MA, et al. An estimate of the US rate of overuse of screening colonoscopy: a systematic review. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022;37:1754–1762. [PubMed: 35212879]
200. Mysliwiec PA, Brown ML, Klabunde CN, et al. Are physicians doing too much colonoscopy? A national survey of colorectal surveillance after polypectomy. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;141:264–71. [PubMed: 15313742]

201. Laiyemo AO, Pinsky PF, Marcus PM, et al. Utilization and yield of surveillance colonoscopy in the continued follow-up study of the polyp prevention trial. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009;7:562–7; quiz 497. [PubMed: 19138760]
202. Schoen RE, Pinsky PF, Weissfeld JL, et al. Utilization of surveillance colonoscopy in community practice. *Gastroenterology* 2010;138:73–81. [PubMed: 19818779]
203. Anderson JC, Baron JA, Ahnen DJ, et al. Factors associated with shorter colonoscopy surveillance intervals for patients with low-risk colorectal adenomas and effects on outcome. *Gastroenterology* 2017;152:1933–1943 e5. [PubMed: 28219690]
204. Dong J, Wang LF, Ardolino E, et al. Real-world adherence to the 2020 United States Multi-Society Task Force polypectomy surveillance guidelines: an observational study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;10.1016/j.gie.2022.08.020.
205. Saini SD, Nayak RS, Kuhn L, et al. Why don't gastroenterologists follow colon polyp surveillance guidelines?: results of a national survey. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2009;43:554–8. [PubMed: 19542818]
206. Kim ER, Sinn DH, Kim JY, et al. Factors associated with adherence to the recommended postpolypectomy surveillance interval. *Surg Endosc* 2012;26:1690–5. [PubMed: 22437946]
207. Patel N, Tong L, Ahn C, et al. Post-polypectomy guideline adherence: importance of belief in guidelines, not guideline knowledge or fear of missed cancer. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015;60:2937–45. [PubMed: 25947332]
208. Desai V, Sussman DA, Greenspan M, et al. Most premature surveillance colonoscopy is not attributable to bowel preparation or new clinical indications. *Dig Dis Sci* 2016;61:2496–504. [PubMed: 27142669]
209. Calderwood AH, Tosteson TD, Walter LC, et al. Colonoscopy utilization and outcomes in older adults: Data from the New Hampshire Colonoscopy Registry. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2022;70:801–811. [PubMed: 34859887]
210. Meester RGS, Lansdorp-Vogelaar I, Winawer SJ, et al. High-intensity versus low-intensity surveillance for patients with colorectal adenomas: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;10.7326/m18-3633.
211. Rutter MD, East J, Rees CJ, et al. British Society of Gastroenterology/Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland/Public Health England post-polypectomy and post-colorectal cancer resection surveillance guidelines. *Gut* 2020;69:201–223. [PubMed: 31776230]
212. Hassan C, Antonelli G, Dumonceau JM, et al. Post-polypectomy colonoscopy surveillance: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline - Update 2020. *Endoscopy* 2020;52:687–700. [PubMed: 32572858]
213. Magrath M, Yang E, Ahn C, et al. Impact of a clinical decision support system on guideline adherence of surveillance recommendations for colonoscopy after polypectomy. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2018;16:1321–1328. [PubMed: 30442733]
214. Shafer LA, Restall G, Simms A, et al. Clinician based decision tool to guide recommended interval between colonoscopies: development and evaluation pilot study. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2022;22:136. [PubMed: 35581662]
215. Kothari ST, Huang RJ, Shaukat A, et al. ASGE review of adverse events in colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;90:863–876 e33. [PubMed: 31563271]
216. Stock C, Ihle P, Sieg A, et al. Adverse events requiring hospitalization within 30 days after outpatient screening and nonscreening colonoscopies. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2013;77:419–29. [PubMed: 23410698]
217. Rutter CM, Johnson E, Miglioretti DL, et al. Adverse events after screening and follow-up colonoscopy. *Cancer Causes Control* 2012;23:289–96. [PubMed: 22105578]
218. Ladabaum U, Mannalithara A, Desai M, et al. Age-specific rates and time-courses of gastrointestinal and nongastrointestinal complications associated with screening/surveillance colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2021;116:2430–2445. [PubMed: 34693917]
219. 2023 Accreditation Standards for Elements of Performance. The Joint Commission.
220. Carrico R, Ramirez J. A process for analysis of sentinel events due to health care-associated infection. *Am J Infect Control* 2007;35:501–7. [PubMed: 17936140]

221. Bagian JP, Gosbee J, Lee CZ, et al. The Veterans Affairs root cause analysis system in action. *Jt Comm J Qual Improv* 2002;28:531–45. [PubMed: 12369156]
222. Wood LJ, Wiegmann DA. Beyond the corrective action hierarchy: A systems approach to organizational change. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2020;32:438–444. [PubMed: 32578858]
223. Patra KP, De Jesus O. Sentinel Event. *StatPearls*. Treasure Island (FL), 2022.
224. de' Angelis N, Di Saverio S, Chiara O, et al. 2017 WSES guidelines for the management of iatrogenic colonoscopy perforation. *World J Emerg Surg* 2018;13:5. [PubMed: 29416554]
225. Fruhmorgen P, Demling L. Complications of diagnostic and therapeutic colonoscopy in the Federal Republic of Germany. Results of an inquiry. *Endoscopy* 1979;11:146–50. [PubMed: 446429]
226. Silvis SE, Nebel O, Rogers G, et al. Endoscopic complications. Results of the 1974 American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Survey. *Jama* 1976;235:928–30. [PubMed: 128642]
227. Lee JS, Kim JY, Kang BM, et al. Clinical outcomes of laparoscopic versus open surgery for repairing colonoscopic perforation: a multicenter study. *Surg Today* 2021;51:285–292. [PubMed: 32844311]
228. Iqbal CW, Cullinane DC, Schiller HJ, et al. Surgical management and outcomes of 165 colonoscopic perforations from a single institution. *Arch Surg* 2008;143:701–6; discussion 706–7. [PubMed: 18645114]
229. Iqbal CW, Chun YS, Farley DR. Colonoscopic perforations: a retrospective review. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2005;9:1229–35; discussion 1236. [PubMed: 16332478]
230. Anderson ML, Pasha TM, Leighton JA. Endoscopic perforation of the colon: lessons from a 10-year study. *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 2000;95:3418–22. [PubMed: 11151871]
231. Rai V, Mishra N. Colonoscopic Perforations. *Clin Colon Rectal Surg* 2018;31:41–46. [PubMed: 29379407]
232. Lin J, United States. Agency for Healthcare R, Quality, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer : a systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), 2016.
233. Reumkens A, Rondagh EJ, Bakker CM, et al. Post-colonoscopy complications: a systematic review, time trends, and meta-analysis of population-based studies. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2016;111:1092–101. [PubMed: 27296945]
234. Warren JL, Klabunde CN, Mariotto AB, et al. Adverse events after outpatient colonoscopy in the Medicare population. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;150:849–57, W152. [PubMed: 19528563]
235. Mukewar S, Costedio M, Wu X, et al. Severe adverse outcomes of endoscopic perforations in patients with and without IBD. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2014;20:2056–66. [PubMed: 25265263]
236. Lohsiriwat V. Colonoscopic perforation: incidence, risk factors, management and outcome. *World J Gastroenterol* 2010;16:425–30. [PubMed: 20101766]
237. Bielawska B, Day AG, Lieberman DA, et al. Risk factors for early colonoscopic perforation include non-gastroenterologist endoscopists: a multivariable analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014;12:85–92. [PubMed: 23891916]
238. Ranasinghe I, Parzynski CS, Searfoss R, et al. Differences in colonoscopy quality among facilities: development of a post-colonoscopy risk-standardized rate of unplanned hospital visits. *Gastroenterology* 2016;150:103–13. [PubMed: 26404952]
239. Rabeneck L, Paszat LF, Hilsden RJ, et al. Bleeding and perforation after outpatient colonoscopy and their risk factors in usual clinical practice. *Gastroenterology* 2008;135:1899–1906, 1906 e1. [PubMed: 18938166]
240. Rex DK. Best practices for resection of diminutive and small polyps in the colorectum. *Gastrointest Endosc Clin N Am* 2019;29:603–612. [PubMed: 31445685]
241. Repici A, Hassan C, Vitetta E, et al. Safety of cold polypectomy for <10mm polyps at colonoscopy: a prospective multicenter study. *Endoscopy* 2012;44:27–31. [PubMed: 22125197]
242. Uno Y, Obara K, Zheng P, et al. Cold snare excision is a safe method for diminutive colorectal polyps. *Tohoku J Exp Med* 1997;183:243–9. [PubMed: 9549824]

243. Memon MA, Memon B, Yunus RM, et al. Carbon dioxide versus air insufflation for elective colonoscopy: a meta-analysis and systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2016;26:102–16. [PubMed: 26841319]
244. Yuan X, Gao H, Liu C, et al. Effectiveness and safety of the different endoscopic resection methods for 10- to 20-mm nonpedunculated colorectal polyps: A systematic review and pooled analysis. *Saudi J Gastroenterol* 2021;27:331–341. [PubMed: 34643573]
245. Cho SB, Lee WS, Joo YE, et al. Therapeutic options for iatrogenic colon perforation: feasibility of endoscopic clip closure and predictors of the need for early surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2012;26:473–9. [PubMed: 21938583]
246. Baron TH, Song LM, Ross A, et al. Use of an over-the-scope clipping device: multicenter retrospective results of the first U.S. experience (with videos). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2012;76:202–8. [PubMed: 22726484]
247. Nivatvongs S Complications in colonoscopic polypectomy - an experience with 1555 polypectomies. *Diseases of the Colon & Rectum* 1986;29:825–830. [PubMed: 3491746]
248. Zubarik R, Fleischer DE, Mastropietro C, et al. Prospective analysis of complications 30 days after outpatient colonoscopy. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 1999;50:322–328. [PubMed: 10462650]
249. Khashab M, Eid E, Rusche M, et al. Incidence and predictors of “late” recurrences after endoscopic piecemeal resection of large sessile adenomas. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2009;70:344–9. [PubMed: 19249767]
250. Buchner AM, Guarner-Argente C, Ginsberg GG. Outcomes of EMR of defiant colorectal lesions directed to an endoscopy referral center. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2012;76:255–63. [PubMed: 22657404]
251. Singh M, Mehta N, Murthy UK, et al. Postpolypectomy bleeding in patients undergoing colonoscopy on uninterrupted clopidogrel therapy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2010;71:998–1005. [PubMed: 20226452]
252. Witt DM, Delate T, McCool KH, et al. Incidence and predictors of bleeding or thrombosis after polypectomy in patients receiving and not receiving anticoagulation therapy. *J Thromb Haemost* 2009;7:1982–9. [PubMed: 19719825]
253. Kim HS, Kim TI, Kim WH, et al. Risk factors for immediate postpolypectomy bleeding of the colon: a multicenter study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2006;101:1333–41. [PubMed: 16771958]
254. Buddingh KT, Herngreen T, Haringsma J, et al. Location in the right hemi-colon is an independent risk factor for delayed post-polypectomy hemorrhage: a multi-center case-control study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2011;106:1119–24. [PubMed: 21266961]
255. Kim JH, Lee HJ, Ahn JW, et al. Risk factors for delayed post-polypectomy hemorrhage: a case-control study. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013;28:645–9. [PubMed: 23369027]
256. Consolo P, Luigiano C, Strangio G, et al. Efficacy, risk factors and complications of endoscopic polypectomy: ten year experience at a single center. *World J Gastroenterol* 2008;14:2364–9. [PubMed: 18416463]
257. Parra-Blanco A, Kaminaga N, Kojima T, et al. Colonoscopic polypectomy with cutting current: is it safe? *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2000;51:676–81. [PubMed: 10840299]
258. Van Gossum A, Cozzoli A, Adler M, et al. Colonoscopic snare polypectomy: analysis of 1485 resections comparing two types of current. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1992;38:472–5. [PubMed: 1511824]
259. Pohl H, Grimm IS, Moyer MT, et al. Effects of blended (yellow) vs forced coagulation (blue) currents on adverse events, complete resection, or polyp recurrence after polypectomy in a large randomized trial. *Gastroenterology* 2020;159:119–128 e2. [PubMed: 32173478]
260. Committee ASoP, Acosta RD, Abraham NS, et al. The management of antithrombotic agents for patients undergoing GI endoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;83:3–16. [PubMed: 26621548]
261. Telford JJ, Abraham NS. Management of antiplatelet and anticoagulant agents before and after polypectomy. *Gastrointest Endosc Clin N Am* 2022;32:299–312. [PubMed: 35361337]
262. Chang LC, Chang CY, Chen CY, et al. Cold versus hot snare polypectomy for small colorectal polyps : a pragmatic randomized controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2023;176:311–319. [PubMed: 36802753]

263. Di Giorgio P, De Luca L, Calcagno G, et al. Detachable snare versus epinephrine injection in the prevention of postpolypectomy bleeding: a randomized and controlled study. *Endoscopy* 2004;36:860–3. [PubMed: 15452780]
264. Spadaccini M, Albeniz E, Pohl H, et al. Prophylactic clipping after colorectal endoscopic resection prevents bleeding of large, proximal polyps: meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Gastroenterology* 2020;159:148–158 e11. [PubMed: 32247023]
265. Rex DK, Lewis BS, Waye JD. Colonoscopy and endoscopic therapy for delayed post-polypectomy hemorrhage. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1992;38:127–9. [PubMed: 1568607]
266. Guo XF, Yu XA, Hu JC, et al. Endoscopic management of delayed bleeding after polypectomy of small colorectal polyps: two or more clips may be safe. *Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf)* 2022;10:goab051. [PubMed: 35382164]
267. Rubin DT, Ananthakrishnan AN, Siegel CA, et al. ACG Clinical Guideline: Ulcerative Colitis in Adults. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2019;114:384–413. [PubMed: 30840605]
268. Satsangi J, Silverberg MS, Vermeire S, et al. The Montreal classification of inflammatory bowel disease: controversies, consensus, and implications. *Gut* 2006;55:749–53. [PubMed: 16698746]
269. Turner D, Ricciuto A, Lewis A, et al. STRIDE-II: An Update on the Selecting Therapeutic Targets in Inflammatory Bowel Disease (STRIDE) Initiative of the International Organization for the Study of IBD (IOIBD): Determining Therapeutic Goals for Treat-to-Target strategies in IBD. *Gastroenterology* 2021;160:1570–1583. [PubMed: 33359090]
270. Shah SC, Colombel JF, Sands BE, et al. Mucosal healing is associated with improved long-term outcomes of patients with ulcerative colitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2016;14:1245–1255 e8. [PubMed: 26829025]
271. Limdi JK, Picco M, Farraye FA. A review of endoscopic scoring systems and their importance in a treat-to-target approach in inflammatory bowel disease (with videos). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;91:733–745. [PubMed: 31786161]
272. Schroeder KW, Tremaine WJ, Ilstrup DM. Coated oral 5-aminosalicylic acid therapy for mildly to moderately active ulcerative colitis. A randomized study. *N Engl J Med* 1987;317:1625–9. [PubMed: 3317057]
273. Lobaton T, Bessissow T, De Hertogh G, et al. The Modified Mayo Endoscopic Score (MMES): a new index for the assessment of extension and severity of endoscopic activity in ulcerative colitis patients. *J Crohns Colitis* 2015;9:846–52. [PubMed: 26116558]
274. Travis SP, Schnell D, Krzeski P, et al. Developing an instrument to assess the endoscopic severity of ulcerative colitis: the Ulcerative Colitis Endoscopic Index of Severity (UCEIS). *Gut* 2012;61:535–42. [PubMed: 21997563]
275. Ikeya K, Hanai H, Sugimoto K, et al. The ulcerative colitis endoscopic index of severity more accurately reflects clinical outcomes and long-term prognosis than the Mayo Endoscopic Score. *J Crohns Colitis* 2016;10:286–95. [PubMed: 26581895]
276. Samuel S, Bruining DH, Loftus EV, Jr., et al. Validation of the ulcerative colitis colonoscopic index of severity and its correlation with disease activity measures. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013;11:49–54 e1. [PubMed: 22902762]
277. Iacucci M, Smith SCL, Bazarova A, et al. An international multicenter real-life prospective study of electronic chromoendoscopy score PICaSSO in ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterology* 2021;160:1558–1569 e8. [PubMed: 33347880]
278. Daperno M, Comberlato M, Bossa F, et al. Training programs on endoscopic scoring systems for inflammatory bowel disease lead to a significant increase in interobserver agreement among community gastroenterologists. *J Crohns Colitis* 2017;11:556–561. [PubMed: 28453758]
279. Mary JY, Modigliani R. Development and validation of an endoscopic index of the severity for Crohn's disease: a prospective multicentre study. *Groupe d'Etudes Therapeutiques des Affections Inflammatoires du Tube Digestif (GETAID)*. *Gut* 1989;30:983–9. [PubMed: 2668130]
280. Khanna R, Zou G, D'Haens G, et al. Reliability among central readers in the evaluation of endoscopic findings from patients with Crohn's disease. *Gut* 2016;65:1119–25. [PubMed: 25935574]
281. Khanna R, Zou G, Stitt L, et al. Responsiveness of endoscopic indices of disease activity for Crohn's disease. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2017;112:1584–1592. [PubMed: 28071654]

282. Daperno M, D'Haens G, Van Assche G, et al. Development and validation of a new, simplified endoscopic activity score for Crohn's disease: the SES-CD. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2004;60:505–12. [PubMed: 15472670]
283. Daperno M, Comberlato M, Bossa F, et al. Inter-observer agreement in endoscopic scoring systems: preliminary report of an ongoing study from the Italian Group for Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IG-IBD). *Dig Liver Dis* 2014;46:969–73. [PubMed: 25154049]
284. Sipponen T, Nuutinen H, Turunen U, et al. Endoscopic evaluation of Crohn's disease activity: comparison of the CDEIS and the SES-CD. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2010;16:2131–6. [PubMed: 20848462]
285. Devlin SM, Melmed GY, Irving PM, et al. Recommendations for quality colonoscopy reporting for patients with inflammatory bowel disease: Results from a RAND appropriateness panel. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2016;22:1418–24. [PubMed: 27057680]
286. Peyrin-Biroulet L, Sandborn W, Sands BE, et al. Selecting therapeutic targets in inflammatory bowel disease (STRIDE): determining therapeutic goals for treat-to-target. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015;110:1324–38. [PubMed: 26303131]
287. Rutgeerts P, Geboes K, Vantrappen G, et al. Predictability of the postoperative course of Crohn's disease. *Gastroenterology* 1990;99:956–63. [PubMed: 2394349]
288. Gordon H, Biancone L, Fiorino G, et al. ECCO Guidelines on Inflammatory Bowel Disease and Malignancies. *J Crohns Colitis* 2022;10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjac187.
289. Birch RJ, Burr N, Subramanian V, et al. Inflammatory bowel disease-associated colorectal cancer epidemiology and outcomes: an english population-based study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2022;117:1858–1870. [PubMed: 36327438]
290. Bogach J, Pond G, Eskicioglu C, et al. Age-related survival differences in patients with inflammatory bowel disease-associated colorectal cancer: a population-based cohort study. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2019;25:1957–1965. [PubMed: 31066449]
291. Murthy SK, Feuerstein JD, Nguyen GC, et al. AGA clinical practice update on endoscopic surveillance and management of colorectal dysplasia in inflammatory bowel diseases: expert review. *Gastroenterology* 2021;161:1043–1051 e4. [PubMed: 34416977]
292. Lamb CA, Kennedy NA, Raine T, et al. British Society of Gastroenterology consensus guidelines on the management of inflammatory bowel disease in adults. *Gut* 2019;68:s1–s106. [PubMed: 31562236]
293. Bye WA, Ma C, Nguyen TM, et al. Strategies for detecting colorectal cancer in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: a cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2018;113:1801–1809. [PubMed: 30353058]
294. Rabbenou W, Ullman TA. Risk of colon cancer and recommended surveillance strategies in patients with ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am* 2020;49:791–807. [PubMed: 33121696]
295. Shaukat A, Tuskey A, Rao VL, et al. Interventions to improve adenoma detection rates for colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2022;96:171–183. [PubMed: 35680469]
296. Komanduri S, Dominitz JA, Rabeneck L, et al. AGA White Paper: challenges and gaps in innovation for the performance of colonoscopy for screening and surveillance of colorectal cancer. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;20:2198–2209 e3. [PubMed: 35688352]
297. Lam AY, Duloy AM, Keswani RN. Quality indicators for the detection and removal of colorectal polyps and interventions to improve them. *Gastrointest Endosc Clin N Am* 2022;32:329–349. [PubMed: 35361339]
298. Gubbiotti A, Spadaccini M, Badalamenti M, et al. Key factors for improving adenoma detection rate. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;16:819–833. [PubMed: 36151898]
299. Keswani RN, Crockett SD, Calderwood AH. AGA clinical practice update on strategies to improve quality of screening and surveillance colonoscopy: expert review. *Gastroenterology* 2021;161:701–711. [PubMed: 34334168]
300. May FP, Shaukat A. State of the science on quality indicators for colonoscopy and how to achieve them. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2020;115:1183–1190. [PubMed: 32759620]

301. Kaminski MF, Wieszczy P, Rupinski M, et al. Increased rate of adenoma detection associates with reduced risk of colorectal cancer and death. *Gastroenterology* 2017;153:98–105. [PubMed: 28428142]
302. Toyoshima O, Yoshida S, Nishizawa T, et al. Simple feedback of colonoscopy performance improved the number of adenomas per colonoscopy and serrated polyp detection rate. *Endosc Int Open* 2021;9:E1032–E1038. [PubMed: 34222627]
303. Boregowda U, Desai M, Nutalapati V, et al. Impact of feedback on adenoma detection rate: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Gastroenterol* 2021;34:214–223. [PubMed: 33654362]
304. Gurudu SR, Boroff ES, Crowell MD, et al. Impact of feedback on adenoma detection rates: Outcomes of quality improvement program. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018;33:645–649. [PubMed: 28892839]
305. Inra JA, Naylor J, Rosenblatt M, et al. Comparison of colonoscopy quality measures across various practice settings and the impact of performance scorecards. *Dig Dis Sci* 2017;62:894–902. [PubMed: 27995405]
306. Kahi CJ, Ballard D, Shah AS, et al. Impact of a quarterly report card on colonoscopy quality measures. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2013;77:925–31. [PubMed: 23472996]
307. Zawaly K, Rumbolt C, Abou-Setta AM, et al. The efficacy of split-dose bowel preparations for polyp detection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2019;114:884–892. [PubMed: 30865011]
308. Desai M, Bilal M, Hamade N, et al. Increasing adenoma detection rates in the right side of the colon comparing retroflexion with a second forward view: a systematic review. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;89:453–459 e3. [PubMed: 30222971]
309. Cohen J, Grunwald D, Grossberg LB, et al. The effect of right colon retroflexion on adenoma detection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2017;51:818–824. [PubMed: 27683963]
310. Ngu WS, Bevan R, Tsiamoulos ZP, et al. Improved adenoma detection with Endocuff Vision: the ADENOMA randomised controlled trial. *Gut* 2019;68:280–288. [PubMed: 29363535]
311. Jacob A, Schafer A, Yong J, et al. Endocuff Vision-assisted colonoscopy: a randomized controlled trial. *ANZ J Surg* 2019;89:E174–E178. [PubMed: 30896062]
312. Williet N, Tournier Q, Vernet C, et al. Effect of Endocuff-assisted colonoscopy on adenoma detection rate: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Endoscopy* 2018;50:846–860. [PubMed: 29698990]
313. Facciorusso A, Del Prete V, Buccino RV, et al. Comparative efficacy of colonoscope distal attachment devices in increasing rates of adenoma detection: a network meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018;16:1209–1219 e9. [PubMed: 29133257]
314. Leung FW, Koo M, Jia H, et al. Water exchange (WE) and quality improvement-enhanced advanced adenoma detection: a pooled data analysis of 6 randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2020;54:212–217. [PubMed: 31904682]
315. Leung FW, Koo M, Cadoni S, et al. Water exchange produces significantly higher adenoma detection rate than water immersion: pooled data from 2 multisite randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2019;53:204–209. [PubMed: 29505552]
316. Zhao SB, Wan H, Fu HY, et al. Quantitative assessment of the effect of position changes during colonoscopy withdrawal. *J Dig Dis* 2016;17:357–65. [PubMed: 27028973]
317. Waldmann E, Britto-Arias M, Gessl I, et al. Endoscopists with low adenoma detection rates benefit from high-definition endoscopy. *Surg Endosc* 2015;29:466–73. [PubMed: 25005016]
318. Kaminski MF, Anderson J, Valori R, et al. Leadership training to improve adenoma detection rate in screening colonoscopy: a randomised trial. *Gut* 2016;65:616–24. [PubMed: 25670810]
319. Evans B, Pace D, Borgaonkar M, et al. Effect of an educational intervention on colonoscopy quality outcomes. *Surg Endosc* 2020;34:5142–5147. [PubMed: 31820159]
320. Wallace MB, Crook JE, Thomas CS, et al. Effect of an endoscopic quality improvement program on adenoma detection rates: a multicenter cluster-randomized controlled trial in a clinical practice setting (EQUIP-3). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2017;85:538–545 e4. [PubMed: 27473182]

321. Ussui V, Coe S, Rizk C, et al. Stability of increased adenoma detection at colonoscopy. Follow-up of an endoscopic quality improvement program-EQUIP-II. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015;110:489–96. [PubMed: 25267326]
322. Coe SG, Crook JE, Diehl NN, et al. An endoscopic quality improvement program improves detection of colorectal adenomas. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:219–26; quiz 227. [PubMed: 23295274]
323. The Paris endoscopic classification of superficial neoplastic lesions: esophagus, stomach, and colon. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2003;53:s3–43.
324. Tadepalli US, Feihel D, Miller KM, et al. A morphologic analysis of sessile serrated polyps observed during routine colonoscopy (with video). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2011;74:1360–8. [PubMed: 22018553]
325. Bond A, O'Toole P, Fisher G, et al. New-generation high-definition colonoscopes increase adenoma detection when screening a moderate-risk population for colorectal cancer. *Clin Colorectal Cancer* 2017;16:44–50. [PubMed: 27528514]
326. Zimmermann-Fraedrich K, Groth S, Sehner S, et al. Effects of two instrument-generation changes on adenoma detection rate during screening colonoscopy: results from a prospective randomized comparative study. *Endoscopy* 2018;50:878–885. [PubMed: 30036893]
327. Tziatzios G, Gkolfakis P, Lazaridis LD, et al. High-definition colonoscopy for improving adenoma detection: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;91:1027–1036 e9. [PubMed: 31954133]
328. Atkinson NSS, Ket S, Bassett P, et al. Narrow-band imaging for detection of neoplasia at colonoscopy: a meta-analysis of data from individual patients in randomized controlled trials. *Gastroenterology* 2019;157:462–471. [PubMed: 30998991]
329. Omata F, Ohde S, Deshpande GA, et al. Image-enhanced, chromo, and cap-assisted colonoscopy for improving adenoma/neoplasia detection rate: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2014;49:222–37. [PubMed: 24328858]
330. Shu X, Wu G, Zhang Y, et al. Diagnostic value of linked color imaging based on endoscopy for gastric intestinal metaplasia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Transl Med* 2021;9:506. [PubMed: 33850903]
331. Suzuki S, Aniwan S, Chiu HM, et al. Linked-color imaging detects more colorectal adenoma and serrated lesions: an international randomized controlled trial. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;10.1016/j.cgh.2022.10.021.
332. Pan H, Cai M, Liao Q, et al. Artificial Intelligence-Aid Colonoscopy Vs. Conventional Colonoscopy for Polyp and Adenoma Detection: A Systematic Review of 7 Discordant Meta-Analyses. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2021;8:775604. [PubMed: 35096870]
333. Huang D, Shen J, Hong J, et al. Effect of artificial intelligence-aided colonoscopy for adenoma and polyp detection: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2022;37:495–506. [PubMed: 34762157]
334. Mori Y, Wang P, Loberg M, et al. Impact of artificial intelligence on colonoscopy surveillance after polyp removal: A pooled analysis of randomized trials. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022;10.1016/j.cgh.2022.08.022.
335. Wallace MB, Sharma P, Bhandari P, et al. Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Miss Rate of Colorectal Neoplasia. *Gastroenterology* 2022;163:295–304 e5. [PubMed: 35304117]
336. Ladabaum U, Shepard J, Weng Y, et al. Computer-aided detection of polyps does not improve colonoscopist performance in a pragmatic implementation trial. *Gastroenterology* 2023;164:481–483 e6. [PubMed: 36528131]
337. Levy I, Bruckmayer L, Klang E, et al. Artificial intelligence-aided colonoscopy does not increase adenoma detection rate in routine clinical practice. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2022;117:1871–1873. [PubMed: 36001408]
338. Nehme F, Coronel E, Barringer DA, et al. Performance and attitudes toward real-time computer-aided polyp detection during colonoscopy in a large tertiary referral center in the United States. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2023;98:100–109 e6. [PubMed: 36801459]
339. Anderson JT. Assessments and skills improvement for endoscopists. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol* 2016;30:453–71. [PubMed: 27345651]

340. Bowles CJ, Leicester R, Romaya C, et al. A prospective study of colonoscopy practice in the UK today: are we adequately prepared for national colorectal cancer screening tomorrow? *Gut* 2004;53:277–83. [PubMed: 14724164]
341. Lee TJ, Rutter MD, Blanks RG, et al. Colonoscopy quality measures: experience from the NHS Bowel Cancer Screening Programme. *Gut* 2012;61:1050–7. [PubMed: 21940723]
342. Burr NE, Derbyshire E, Taylor J, et al. Variation in post-colonoscopy colorectal cancer across colonoscopy providers in English National Health Service: population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2019;367:l6090. [PubMed: 31722875]
343. Bronzwaer MES, Depla A, van Lelyveld N, et al. Quality assurance of colonoscopy within the Dutch national colorectal cancer screening program. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2019;89:1–13. [PubMed: 30240879]
344. Brenner H, Hoffmeister M, Brenner G, et al. Expected reduction of colorectal cancer incidence within 8 years after introduction of the German screening colonoscopy programme: estimates based on 1,875,708 screening colonoscopies. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;45:2027–33. [PubMed: 19289271]
345. Gawron AJ, Yao Y, Gupta S, et al. Simplifying measurement of adenoma detection rates for colonoscopy. *Dig Dis Sci* 2021;66:3149–3155. [PubMed: 33029706]
346. Corley DA, Jensen CD, Lee JK, et al. Impact of a scalable training program on the quality of colonoscopy performance and risk of post-colonoscopy colorectal cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2023;10.1016/j.gie.2023.04.2073.
347. Mazurek M, Murray A, Heitman SJ, et al. Association between endoscopist specialty and colonoscopy quality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2021;10.1016/j.cgh.2021.08.029.
348. Xu L, Zhang Y, Song H, et al. Nurse participation in colonoscopy observation versus the colonoscopist alone for polyp and adenoma detection: a meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2016;2016:7631981. [PubMed: 26839543]

Table 1.
Evidence indicates that colonoscopy is able to reduce the incidence of CRC and prevent CRC mortality – references 8-23

• Incidence of CRC lower in patients undergoing screening fecal blood tests • Incidence of right colon cancer lower in patients undergoing screening flexible sigmoidoscopy and liberal rules for performing colonoscopy based on flexible sig findings • CRC incidence and mortality reduced in adenoma cohorts compared to reference populations • CRC incidence in screening cohorts compared to reference populations • Case control studies in screening and non-screening populations showing reduction in incidence and mortality • Case control studies showing reductions in right sided CRC incidence and mortality in screening and non-screening populations • Evidence from U.S. population trends • Studies showing variable prevention between endoscopists with different detection skills
--

Table 2.

Priority quality indicators for colonoscopy

-
- Adenoma detection rate
 - Sessile serrated lesion detection rate *
 - Rate of using recommended screening, surveillance intervals
 - Bowel preparation adequacy rate *
 - Cecal intubation rate **
-

* Designates a new priority indicator

** Should be measured for all colonoscopists but can be measured intermittently or not at all once consistent high level performance has been demonstrated

Table 3.

Quality indicators for colonoscopy

General Colonoscopy Quality Indicators			
Quality indicator	Strength of recommendation	Measure type	Performance target (%)
<i>Pre-procedure</i>			
1. Frequency with which colonoscopy is performed for an appropriate indication and the indication is documented	1C+	Process	≥ 95%
2. *Rate of bowel preparation adequacy Percentage of patients undergoing colonoscopy with adequate bowel preparation, preferably defined as Boston Bowel Preparation Scale score ≥ 2 in each of 3 colon segments, or by description of the preparation as excellent, good, or adequate. The recommended screening or surveillance interval should be consistent with US Multi-Society Task Force recommendations.	1C	Process	≥ 90%
<i>Intra-procedure</i>			
3. *Cecal intubation rate Percentage of patients undergoing colonoscopy with intact colons who have full intubation of the cecum with photo documentation of cecal landmarks	1C	Process	≥ 95%
Detection indicators for colonoscopy			
4. *Adenoma detection rate Percentage of patients ≥ 45 years old undergoing colonoscopy for screening, surveillance, or diagnostic indications other than positive non-colonoscopy screening tests (e.g., fecal tests or CT colonography) who have one or more conventional adenomas detected and verified by pathology. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, genetic cancer syndromes (e.g., polyposis), IBD, undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms, are excluded from the calculation.	1C+	Outcome	≥ 35%
5. Percentage of patients with positive fecal screening tests (fecal blood or mt-sDNA) with one or more conventional adenomas resected and documented by pathology	1C	Outcome	≥ 50%
6. Number of conventional adenomas detected per colonoscopy in patients age ≥ 45 years with indications of screening, surveillance, or diagnosis of symptoms. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, IBD, or undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms are excluded from the calculation.	2C	Outcome	≥ 0.6
7. *Sessile serrated lesion detection rate Percentage of patients age ≥ 45 years undergoing screening, surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy for symptoms with one or more sessile serrated lesions removed and documented by pathology. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, IBD, or undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms are excluded from the calculation.	2C	Outcome	> 6%
8. Average withdrawal time in normal colonoscopies without biopsies or polypectomies in persons age ≥ 45 years undergoing screening, surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy. Patients with positive non-colonoscopy screening tests, cancer genetic (e.g., polyposis) syndromes, IBD, or undergoing colonoscopy for therapy of known neoplasms are excluded from the calculation.	2A	Process	≥ 8 minutes
Resection indicators			
9. Percentage of polyp resections for which the report documents the lesion size, shape, location and method of resection	3	Process	≥ 98%
10. Percentage of 4–9 mm lesions that are resected using a cold snare	1A	Process	≥ 90%
<i>Post-procedure</i>			
11. *Use of appropriate screening and surveillance intervals Frequency with which colonoscopies follow recommended post-polypectomy and post-cancer resection surveillance intervals, and frequency	1C	Process	≥ 90%

General Colonoscopy Quality Indicators			
Quality indicator	Strength of recommendation	Measure type	Performance target (%)
of 10-year intervals between screening colonoscopies in average risk patients who have negative examination results and adequate bowel cleansing			
12. Frequency of serious adverse events (perforation, post-polypectomy bleeding, and mortality) associated with colonoscopy are tracked, documented, and reviewed by a quality improvement committee to assess for system and clinical areas of improvement	1C	Process	≥ 95%
Quality indicators for colonoscopy in inflammatory bowel disease			
Inflammatory bowel disease Intra-Procedure Colonoscopy Indicators			
13. Percentage of colonoscopies performed for the indication ulcerative colitis in which a formal assessment of disease extent and activity [MES (Mayo Endoscopic Score), MMES (Modified Mayo Endoscopic Score), UCEIS (Ulcerative Colitis Endoscopic Index of Severity) or UCCIS (Ulcerative Colitis Colonoscopic Index of Severity)] is recorded	3	Process	≥ 90%
14. Percentage of colonoscopies performed for the indication Crohn's disease in which a formal disease activity score [CDEIS (Crohn's Disease Endoscopic Index of Severity), SES-CD (Simple Endoscopic Activity Score in Crohn's Disease), or Rutgeerts score] is reported	3	Process	≥ 90%
Inflammatory bowel disease Post-Colonoscopy Quality Indicators			
15. Frequency of appropriate recommendation for follow-up surveillance colonoscopy interval for ulcerative colitis/indeterminate colitis patients undergoing dysplasia screening without dysplasia detected	3	Process	≥ 90%

* Indicates priority indicator

Table 4.
Quality indicators common to all endoscopic procedures with associated performance targets

Quality indicator	Strength of recommendation	Measure type	Performance target (%)
<i>Pre-procedure</i>			
1. Frequency with which endoscopy is performed for an indication that is included in a published standard list of appropriate indications, and the indication is documented (priority indicator)	1C+	Process	> 95%
2. Frequency with which informed consent is obtained and documented	3	Process	> 98
3. Frequency with which pre-procedure history and directed physical examination are performed and documented	3	Process	> 98
4. Frequency with which a sedation plan that includes risk for sedation-related adverse events is documented before sedation is initiated	3	Process	> 98
5. Frequency with which prophylactic antibiotics are administered for appropriate indications (priority indicator)	Varies	Process	> 98
6. Frequency with which management of antithrombotic therapy is formulated and documented before the procedure (priority indicator)	3	Process	> 95
7. Frequency with which a team pause is performed and documented	3	Process	> 98
8. Frequency with which endoscopy is performed or supervised by an individual who is fully trained and appropriately credentialed to perform that particular procedure	3	Process	> 98
<i>Intra-procedure</i>			
9. Frequency with which photodocumentation is performed	3	Process	> 90
10. Frequency with which patient monitoring during sedation is performed and documented	3	Process	> 98
11. Frequency with which procedure interruption and premature termination because of sedation-related issues is documented	3	Process	> 98
12. Frequency with which endoscopic specimen verification is performed and documented	3	Process	> 98
<i>Post-procedure</i>			
13. Frequency with which discharge from the endoscopy unit according to predetermined discharge criteria is documented	3	Process	> 98
14. Frequency with which patient instructions are provided	3	Process	> 98
15. Frequency with which endoscopic findings, pathology results, and follow-up recommendations are communicated to the patient and appropriate providers	3	Process	> 98
16. Frequency with which a complete procedure report is created	3	Process	> 98
17. Frequency with which adverse events are documented (priority indicator)	3	Process	> 98
18. Frequency with which adverse events occur	Varies	Outcome	N/A
19. Frequency with which patient satisfaction data are collected	N/A	Outcome	N/A

Table 5.

Strength of recommendation *

Strength of recommendation	Clarity of benefit	Methodologic strength supporting evidence	Implications
1A	Clear	Randomized trials without important limitations	Strong recommendation; can be applied to most clinical settings
1B	Clear	Randomized trials with important limitations (inconsistent results, nonfatal methodologic flaws)	Strong recommendation; likely to apply to most practice settings
1C+	Clear	Overwhelming evidence from observational studies	Strong recommendation, can apply to most practice settings in most situations
1C	Clear	Observational studies	Intermediate-strength recommendation, may change when stronger evidence is available
2A	Unclear	Randomized trials without important limitations	Intermediate-strength recommendation; best action may differ depending on circumstances or patients' or societal values
2B	Unclear	Randomized trials with important limitations (inconsistent results, nonfatal methodologic flaws)	Weak recommendation; alternative approaches may be better under some circumstances
2C	Unclear	Observational studies	Very weak recommendation; alternative approaches are likely to be better under some circumstances
3	Unclear	Expert opinion only	Weak recommendation, likely to change as data becomes available

* Adapted from Guyatt G, Sinclair J, Cook D, et al. Moving from evidence to action. Grading recommendations—a qualitative approach. In: Guyatt G, Rennie D, editors. Users' guides to the medical literature. Chicago: AMA Press; 2002. p. 599–608.

Table 6:**Appropriate indications for colonoscopy**

-
1. Evaluation of unexplained gastrointestinal bleeding
 - a. Hematochezia
 - b. Melena with upper GI cause excluded
 - c. Presence of fecal occult blood
 2. Unexplained iron deficiency anemia
 3. Screening for colorectal neoplasia at recommended intervals in average-risk persons or persons with significant high risk family histories
 4. Surveillance in Lynch Syndrome
 5. Surveillance in patients with polyposis syndromes
 6. Surveillance at recommended intervals for prior colorectal cancer or precancerous lesions
 7. Surveillance at recommended intervals of cancer risk in inflammatory bowel disease
 8. Assessment of disease activity in inflammatory bowel disease for purpose of assessing treatment response
 9. Clinically significant diarrhea of unexplained origin
 10. Evaluation of abnormal imaging of the colorectum that suggests cancer, precancerous lesions or clinically important bowel wall abnormalities
 11. Intraoperative identification of a lesion not apparent or found at surgery
 12. Treatment of bleeding lesions such as vascular malformations, ulceration, neoplasia and post-polypectomy ulcers
 13. Foreign body removal
 14. Excision of polyp or early-stage colorectal cancer
 15. Decompression of acute non-toxic megacolon or sigmoid volvulus
 16. Treatment of stenosis
 17. Palliative treatment of stenosing or bleeding neoplasm
 18. Marking a neoplasm for localization
 19. Positive fecal or blood-based CRC screening test
-

Table 7.

Adenoma detection rate (ADR) in 45–49 year olds vs. 50–54 year olds

Author, Year of Publication, reference number	Years of colonoscopy performance	Number of exams in patients age 45–49 years	ADR 45–49 year olds	ADR 50–54 year olds	Percent of exams 45–49 (%)
Karsenti 2019 ⁶⁴	2016	515	21.2% (19% average risk screen)	25.2%	N/A
Butterly 2021 ⁶⁶	2004–2018	1869	17.5%	22.1%	4.6
Imperiale 2021 mtsDNA study ⁶⁵	2019 *	816	31%	N/A	N/A
Shaukat 2022 ⁶⁷	2015–2019	4841	28.4%	31.1%	3.1
Ladabaum 2022 ⁶⁸	2019–2021 *	350	34.3%	38.2%	11.6%
Liang 2022 GIQuIC ⁶⁹	2010–2020	92752	28.0%	33.0%	5.0%
Bilal 2022 GIQuIC ⁷⁰	2014–2020	47213	28.6%	31.8%	1.6%
Trivedi 2022 ⁷¹ AMSURG → GIQuIC	2014–2021	79934	32%	37.7%	N/A

* all in era after 2018 ACS guidelines

ADR: adenoma detection rate

GIQuIC: GI Quality Improvement Consortium, Ltd., Bethesda, MD

AMSURG: AmSurg Corporation, Nashville TN

Table 8.

Incidence of adenomas at second screening colonoscopy performed 10 years after an initial negative screening colonoscopy

Author, year of publication, reference	Years	1 st screen ADR	2 nd screen ADR
Ponugoti 2017 ⁷⁵	2007–2015		38%
Rex 2018 ⁷⁶	2010–2015	32%	27%
Ladabaum 2021 ²³	2017–2020	36%	29%
Ladabaum 2022 ⁶⁸	2019–2021	43%	33%

ADR: adenoma detection rate

Table 9.

Association of adenoma detection rate and colonoscopy indication

Author, year of publication reference	Years of colonoscopy	All Screen ADR	Surveillance ADR	Symptomatic or Diagnostic ADR	Global ADR
Anderson 2013 ⁷⁷	2009–2011	25%	37%		29%
Marcondes 2015 ⁷⁸	2009–2013	37%	59%	15–34%	39%
Boroff 2017 ⁷⁹	2010–2012	33%	55%	13–33%	37%
Rex 2017 ⁸⁰	2010–2015	42%	54%	29%	45%
Brand 2017 ⁸¹	2013–2015	33–36%	45–47%		36–40%
Kaltenbach 2021 ⁸²	2015	49%	56%	38%	50%
Mikoviny Kajzrlíkova 2021 ⁸⁴	2013–2017	46%	48%	36%	43%
Ladabaum 2021 ²³	2017–2020	36%	44%	17%	
Desai 2022 ⁸³	>2017	50%	64%		55–59%
Shaukat 2022 ⁶⁷	2021	38–41%	52–59%		44–48%

Table 10.

Leading candidates for serrated lesion detection indicator

Rate	Benchmark	Easy to Calculate?	Measures endoscopist detection	Validating data
CSSDR	9%	Requires path, size, and location	Some path influence	9% associated with lowest risk for PCCRC
PSPDR	17%	Location only	Least path dependent	17.0% associated with lowest risk for PCCRC
SSLDR	6%	Path only	Most influenced by path	6.0% associated with lowest risk for PCCRC

CSSDR: (Clinically Significant Serrated Detection Rate): Any serrated lesion (sessile serrated lesion, hyperplastic polyp, or traditional serrated adenoma) ≥ 10 mm, any serrated lesion > 5 mm proximal to the sigmoid colon

PSPDR (Proximal Serrated Polyp Detection Rate): fraction of colonoscopies with one or more serrated polyps (sessile serrated lesion, hyperplastic polyp, or traditional serrated adenoma) proximal to the splenic flexure

SSLDR (Sessile Serrated Lesion Detection Rate): fraction of colonoscopies with one or more sessile serrated lesions

Table 11.

Withdrawal times associated with optimal detection at colonoscopy

Author and reference	Year	Number of patients	Optimal withdrawal time (min)
Barclay ²⁶	2006	2053	> 6
Barclay ¹³³	2008	2325	> 8
Overholt ¹³⁴	2010	15955	> 6
Benson ¹³⁵	2010	550	> 6
Liang ¹³⁶	2012	18003	longer is better
Jover ¹³⁷	2013	4539	> 8
Lee ¹³⁸	2013	31088	10
Butterly ¹³⁹	2014	7972	9
Kashiwagi ¹⁴⁰	2017	1009	9
Yun ¹⁴²	2018	5370	> 9
Patel ¹⁴³	2018	10196	11
Cavicchi ¹⁴⁴	2019	11682	> 8
Jung ¹⁴⁵	2019	724	9
Zhao (RCT) ¹⁴⁷	2020	1027	9
Zhao (RCT) ¹⁴⁸	2022	733	9
Desai ¹⁴⁶	2022	1142	Increased ADR up to 13

WT: withdrawal time

RCT: randomized controlled trial

Table 12.
Suggested scoring systems for inflammatory bowel disease activity

Scoring Scale	Disease	Scoring	Notes
Mayo Endoscopic Score	Ulcerative Colitis	0: normal or inactive colitis 1: erythema, mild decrease in vascularity 2: friability, marked erythema, vascular pattern absent, erosions seen 3: ulcerations and spontaneous bleeding	
SES-CD	Crohn's Disease	0: None 1: aphthous ulcers, <10% ulcerated surface, <50% affected surface, single narrowing passed 2: larger ulcers, 10–30% ulcerative surface, 50–75% affected surface, multiple narrowings 3: very large ulcers, >30% ulcerated surface, >75% affected surface, narrowing cannot be passed	A score is documented from ileum, right colon, transverse, left colon and rectum. Max score 12 per segment, total max 60
Rutgeerts score	Crohn's recurrence in the neo-terminal ileum after surgical resection of the terminal ileum	i0: no lesions, normal appearing neo-terminal ileum i1: <5 aphthous ulcers in neo-terminal ileum i2: >5 aphthous ulcers in the neo-terminal ileum with normal intervening mucosa or skip areas of larger lesions or lesions confined to the ileocolonic anastomosis i3: diffuse aphthous ileitis with diffusely inflamed mucosa i4: diffuse inflammation with large ulcers, nodules and/or narrowing	Endoscopic remission i0 or i1; recurrence is i2-i4 with i3 or i4 most likely to develop clinical relapse

Table 13.

Timing of subsequent colonoscopy for patients with ulcerative/indeterminate colitis undergoing a screening colonoscopy with no dysplasia detected at current colonoscopy.

1 year	2–3 years	3–5 years
• PSC (including post liver transplant) • FH CRC in FDR < 50 years • Prior invisible dysplasia < 5 years ago • Active inflammation (more than mild) • Dense pseudopolyps • Colonic stricture	• Prior resected visible dysplasia < 5 years ago • FH CRC (but no FDR < 50) • Mildly active inflammation • Pseudopolyps (but not dense)	• Mucosal healing on current exam and ≥ 2 exams without dysplasia • Overall disease extent affecting 1/3 or less of colon

Table 14:
Interventions to Improve Adenoma Detection Rate (ADR)

Intervention (with selected references)
Physician report cards ^{302–306}
Public reporting of ADR
Water assistance ^{314, 315}
Second look, either retroflexion in the cecum or second forward look in the proximal colon ^{308, 309}
Dynamic change in patient position ^{316, 317}
High-definition endoscopes ^{325–327}
Distal attachment devices ^{310–313}
Enhanced imaging technology (e.g., narrow-band imaging, i-SCAN, linked-color imaging, blue-laser imaging, chromoendoscopy and methylene blue-MMX (Cosmo Pharmaceuticals, Dublin, Ireland)) ^{295, 328}
Computer aided detection technologies ^{332–335}
Split-dose bowel preparation ³⁰⁷
Nurse assigned to observe colonoscopy monitor ³⁴⁸
Focused educational interventions ^{319–322}
Leadership training in colonoscopy technique ³¹⁸